DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 105 125 CE 003 385

AUTHOR Weatherford, John Wilson
TITLE Identification and Analysis of Issues in Distributive Education.
INSTITUTION South-Western Publishing Co., Cincinnati, Ohio.
REPORT NO Mono-127
PUB DATE Aug 74
NOTE 84p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$4.43 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum; *Distributive Education; *Distributive Education Teachers; Educational Administration; Educational Philosophy; Post Secondary Education; Secondary Education; *Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to analyze the opinions of distributive education leaders about issues in distributive education and to ascertain their opinions on the importance of these issues in determining effective operating procedures in distributive education. The 30 leaders were determined on the basis of the number of times their names were mentioned on a leadership questionnaire which was sent to head State supervisors and teacher educators in the field, and to teacher-coordinators randomly selected from the National Association of Distributive Education Teachers roster. The leaders in turn were questioned on a series of 52 issue statements. Responses to the statements, grouped under four headings: philosophy (19 statements); organization and administration (14 statements); teacher education (15 statements); and curriculum and related issues (four statements), are presented and discussed. Two tables list the choice index ratings (computed on a scale ranging from 5=critical to 1=no importance) on the importance of issue statements and the rank order of importance of issue statements by choice index. In summary, the issue statements are grouped according to the degree of agreement among the respondents, and according to that agreement separated into "principles" and "major issues" in distributive education. (JR)

ED105142

NUMBER 127

IDENTIFICATION AND ANALYSIS OF ISSUES IN DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION

JOHN WILSON WEATHERFORD

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SOUTH-WESTERN MONOGRAPHS

IN BUSINESS AND ECONOMIC EDUCATION

2

We consider it just as much our duty to render service as to publish good business and economic textbooks. Educational monographs are one form of service. We hope that they will serve to promote higher standards of education.

ED105125

IDENTIFICATION AND ANALYSIS OF ISSUES IN DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION

By

John Wilson Weatherford
Central State University
Edmond, Oklahoma

Monograph 127

A portion of a thesis presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of The Ohio State University

1 2 3 4 5 S 8 7 6 5 4

Published August, 1974

SOUTH-WESTERN PUBLISHING CO.

CINCINNATI, OH 45227 WEST CHICAGO, IL 60185 DALLAS, TX 75229
PELHAM MANOR, NY 10803 PALO ALTO, CA 94304
BRIGHTON, ENGLAND

(Printed in U.S.A.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the Problem	1
	Background of the Study	2
	Limitations of the Study	2
II	REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH	4
	Related Studies	4
	Other Studies	11
III	ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA	16
	Section I: Philosophy	16
	Section II: Organization and Administration	31
	Section III: Teacher Education	42
	Section IV: Curriculum and Related Issues	53
	Summary of Findings	56
IV	COMPARISON OF ISSUES WITH PREVIOUS STUDY	69
V	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	74
	Summary	74
	Conclusions	75
	Recommendations for Further Research	77

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Choice Index Ratings on Importance of Issue Statements	64
2	Rank Order of Importance of Issue Statements by Choice Index	64
3	Check-Sheet Statement: Distributive Education Teacher-Coordinators Should Be Required to Renew (Or Supplement) Their Occupational Experience	69
4	Check-Sheet Statement: The Student Placement Activities of the Distributive Education Teacher-Coordinator Should Include:	69
5	Check-Sheet Statement: Coordination in School Systems with More Than One Cooperative Distributive Education Program Should:	70
6	Check-Sheet Statement: In an Ideal Situation the Teacher-Coordinator Should Visit the Student-Trainee on the Job (Or His Training Sponsor) At Least:	71
7	Check-Sheet Statement: Assuming That On-the-Job Experience Is Required, the Experience:	71
8	Check-Sheet Statement: The Approximate Percentage of the Distributive Education Classroom Instructional Time in the Cooperative Program That Should Be Devoted by the Student-Trainee to the Study of His Specific Job Is:	72
9	Check-Sheet Statement: Distributive Education Student in the Cooperative Program:	72

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The development of a nationwide program of distributive education was made possible by a provision in the George-Deen Act (1936) for federal vocational funds for distributive education. Distributive education is a program of instruction in marketing, merchandising, and management. The program is concerned with training needed for purposes of updating, upgrading, career development, and operational management. Distributive education operates at the high school, post high school, and adult levels of instruction.

The program of distributive education has expanded to serve the whole range of distributive occupations, after starting chiefly as a means of training retail sales persons. An expansion in the number and types of courses and classes has kept abreast of changes in the distributive phases of modern business. An important characteristic of distributive education has been the necessity for rapid adjustment to changing local business conditions. This characteristic of being able to be adjusted rapidly has been a principal element in the success of the program. The economic situation shifts constantly, necessitating frequent business surveys and other types of research by those responsible for the administration of the program. Instructional materials and content are planned with the close cooperation of the business community. If this adjustment process is to continue, there must be an awareness of the diversity in the opinions among the people involved with the distributive education program.

In any discipline, there are philosophical differences among leaders within the field; therefore, distributive education is not unique in not having complete agreement in all program areas. From the conflict in philosophical goals and objectives and operational differences, potential issues in distributive education emerge.

Statement of the Problems

The purpose of this study was to analyze the opinions of distributive education leaders about issues in distributive education and to ascertain their opinions on the importance of these issues in determining effective operating procedures in distributive education. To achieve the purpose of this study, it was necessary to:

1. Identify current potential distributive education issues.
2. Develop an issue statement check sheet.
3. Identify the leaders in distributive education.
4. Ascertain the opinions of leaders on issue statements.
5. Determine from the leaders' responses the issues in distributive education.
6. Determine the importance of each of the identified issues.

Background of the Study

Many studies in business education have contained issues in distributive education; however, the respondents for these studies were not restricted to persons involved directly in distributive education.

Although many studies in distributive education have touched upon issues, only one study (Warmke, 1960) was devoted exclusively to distributive education issues. This study made a major contribution to the field of distributive education; however, since this study was completed, there have been many significant developments in distributive education.

1. *Additional funding, which has allowed for the expansion of programming and teacher education.*
2. *Utilization of the project or laboratory method of instruction in distributive education.*
3. *The allowance of flexibility for exemplary programs.*
4. *The emphasis on research in vocational education.*
5. *The emphasis on training persons who are disadvantaged or handicapped.*
6. *The emphasis on program accountability.*
7. *The emphasis on leadership development in vocational education.*
8. *The "across the board" approach which some state departments have taken in regard to cooperative education, teacher education, post-secondary, and adult education.*
9. *The rapid growth of the post-secondary programs in distributive education.*

The findings of the study should be of value to distributive education teacher-coordinators and to teacher educators by making them aware of the major issues which we face in the field. The study should serve to stimulate discussion and clarify thinking with reference to distributive education in the secondary schools and post-secondary institutions, by both defining the major issues and presenting the thinking of the leading distributive educators on these issues.

Limitations of the Study

This study was confined to the analysis of opinions about issues in distributive education. Since the study was based upon opinions, the reader should be cautioned not to draw unwarranted inferences from its findings.

An effort was made to draw opinions from only those persons truly representative of the leadership in distributive education; however, not all opinions are of equal importance. As Hanna indicates, no two opinions can be of equal importance because each opinion is based upon the respondent's ability, interest, and experience with the issue. The value of any person's opinions will be different for each of the several issues.

The procedure of drawing opinions from only those persons engaged in distributive education does not insure that these opinions represent the best

judgment about distributive education issues. Sound opinions about distributive education might come from people not involved in the field, because their thinking would not be clouded by present or previous practices. Consequently, substantial agreement of the respondents about an issue does not necessarily prove the soundness of their judgment. This agreement simply represents the current philosophy of distributive education leaders.

The distributive education leaders identified for this study were selected on the basis of the number of times their names were mentioned on a leadership questionnaire. This leadership questionnaire was sent to the head state supervisors and teacher educators in distributive education as listed on the United States Office of Education directory for each group. The teacher-coordinators who were sent leadership questionnaires were randomly selected from the National Association of Distributive Education Teachers (NADET) roster. The limiting factor here is that all distributive education teachers do not belong to this organization.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

Related Studies

In the review of related research, the investigator found a dire shortage of sophisticated studies pertaining to issues in distributive education. However, the review did produce certain studies which were related in varying degrees to this researcher's endeavor.

The J. Marshall Hanna Study, 1939

Several studies have been concerned with issues in the area of business education; however, the term distributive education was seldom mentioned. J. Marshall Hanna did include a distributive education section in which he considered four distributive education issues.

Hanna determined the major issues in business education by making a careful review of business education literature published from 1928 to 1938 and by interviewing recognized leaders in various subject-matter fields. The issues were evaluated and criticized by graduate students, by leaders in business education, and by business educators, all of whom were encouraged to add to or change the wording of the questions if advisable. The business educators were also asked to rank the issues. A satisfactory trial run of seven issues submitted to fifteen carefully selected leaders provided the basis for the final check sheet of major issues. Only those business educators who were named by ten or more of the 156 teachers who completed the leadership questionnaire were acknowledged as leaders in business education. In this manner, 70 business educators were recognized as leaders in business education.

Hanna classified the 52 fundamental issues into four groups based on the opinions expressed by 58 leaders in business education: Group A, 10 regulative principles on which more than 90 percent of the leaders agreed; Group B, 22 regulative principles with 67 to 89 percent agreement; Group C, 7 issues, each having one contention receiving 50 to 67 percent agreement; Group D, 13 issues, no contention receiving 50 to 67 percent agreement, indicating such a lack of agreement that no trend was apparent.

The Carlos K. Hayden Study, 1950

Carlos K. Hayden completed a follow-up of the Hanna study in 1950; his study, like Hanna's, contained a section on distributive education. Hayden retained the four distributive education issues used by Hanna and added two issues. Hanna served as the major professor for Hayden's study.

For the purpose of this study, a leader in business education was a person who had been recognized by his fellow business teachers as a leader. In order to determine the leaders, a check sheet was submitted to 275

business teachers. These business teachers were asked to list business educators to whom they looked for leadership in the administration of business education, bookkeeping and related subjects, distributive education, general business, office and clerical practice, shorthand and transcription, and typewriting. The respondents were distributed geographically thoughout the United States and represented a sampling as to subject matter interest, institutional organization, and type of position held. On the basis of the replies from 192 respondents, a list of leaders in each of the areas of specialization was compiled for use in this investigation.

The issues included in the survey were obtained by the following methods: (1) by a survey of periodicals, books, yearbooks, and research studies; (2) through a discussion of the problems in business education with fellow business teachers; (3) from panels and round table discussions at conventions; and (4) from selected leaders in business education.

By comparing the findings of his study with Hanna's study, Hayden determined trends of thought with reference to the issues in business education.

Hayden found almost complete agreement (more than 90 percent) on 14 issues. A substantial majority (from 67 to 89 percent) of the leaders tended toward agreement on 19 of the issues. The majority (from 50 to 66 percent) of the respondents tended toward agreement on 13 of the issues. Seven of the issues were found to be highly controversial. No one contention had the support of the majority of the leaders in business education who responded to the questions.

The Eleanor B. Brown Study, 1958

Like Hayden and Hanna, Eleanor B. Brown included a distributive education section in her study. As a part of her study, Brown resubmitted Hayden's issue statements to a group of business educators. Consequently, she used the identical issue statements used by Hayden.

Brown prepared a check sheet of Hayden's 68 major issues and submitted the form to 219 business education leaders in 1957 requesting them to give their opinions on each issue. The leaders had been carefully selected on the basis of a thorough examination of the literature.

Brown established the objectives of business education from 1950 to 1957, determined the practices from 1950 to 1957 in the light of these objectives, determined the relationship between practices and objectives, and made recommendations based on the findings. The chi square (χ^2) was used to compare the responses she obtained from the leaders in 1957 with the responses obtained by Hayden in 1950. By the use of the *t*-test, she considered 56 percent agreement of the 1957 leaders on a principle underlying a major issue to provide sufficient basis for deriving business education objectives. By using this procedure, she established 48 objectives.

To determine relationship of practices in business education to established objectives, Brown reviewed 13 state-wide doctoral studies to interpret practices. She then compared the practices to the established objectives in terms of close, substantial, occasional, remote, and none. The 1957 leaders were in agreement with the 1950 leaders on all but four issues. The section on distributive education showed no difference from Hayden's study.

Several other studies in business education made limited reference to the term distributive education. The omission of the term from certain studies does not mean that distributive education issues were not included in these studies. All of the studies previously mentioned in this chapter had implications for the present study.

The Roman F. Warmke Study, 1960

Roman F. Warmke conducted the only study on general issues in distributive education. The purpose of his study was to analyze the opinions of distributive education leaders concerning current distributive education issues and to ascertain their opinions on the importance of these issues in determining effective operating procedures in distributive education.

Interviews were conducted with eight distributive education educators who were asked to suggest issues. Other means used to identify the issues were: (1) a literature review, (2) interviews with distributive education educators (as above), (3) an analysis of reasons for certain school administrators discontinuing distributive education programs, and (4) an analysis of opinions of merchants about issues.

Informal interviews were held. The interviewee was merely asked to state issues in distributive education. After the interviewee had listed all the issues he could think of, without an attempt to categorize the issues, he was asked if he could think of any issues in suggested categories. Four of the eight people interviewed were from the United States Office of Education and the other four were state supervisors. The United States Office of Education group was selected because it was assumed that the persons involved would have an awareness of which issues existed in the different sections of the country. The state supervisors of distributive education in Colorado, Montana, and Wyoming were selected due to their availability for such an interview.

The interviews proved to be the most helpful procedure used to identify issues.

Warmke conducted interviews with some merchants who favored and some who looked with disfavor on the program and asked them to suggest issues. He reported that this procedure provided only limited information.

Warmke defined leadership as "recognition by fellow workers," and two groups of persons were selected to nominate leaders. One group was composed of United States Office of Education personnel, state distributive education personnel, and distributive education teacher educators. The second group consisted of teacher-coordinators who were recommended by the state supervisors and teacher educators. Those recommended were considered to be operating superior distributive education programs.

The leadership questionnaire was sent to the teacher-coordinators whose names were listed by the state supervisory personnel and the teacher educators. The nominations from this group served to show the validity of the nomination submitted by the supervisory personnel.

Warmke's check sheet was divided into two sections and each section was conducted separately. Part I of the check sheet was devoted exclusively

to issues about minimum requirements for distributive education personnel. Ten minimum requirements for eight distributive education positions were analyzed.

Part II of the issues check sheet was divided into four sections: (1) Objectives, Guidance and Philosophy; (2) Organization and Administration; (3) Curriculum and Related Issues; and (4) Steering and Advisory Committees.

There was a total of 62 issue statements dealing with the above sections. The respondents were given the privilege of writing "no opinion" across the issue statement if they did not have an opinion about the issue.

The respondent was asked to indicate the importance of each of the issue statements. The choices given were (1) crucial, (2) major, and (3) little or no.

Almost all (90 percent or more) of the distributive educators who responded to the issue statement were in agreement on eight statements. A considerable majority (from 67 to 89 percent) of the respondents tended toward agreement on 18 statements. The distributive educators were divided in opinion on 23 of the issue statements; however, there was a tendency (from 50 to 66 percent) in favor of one contention of the issue statement. There was a complete lack of agreement on 13 of the issue statements.

The Jerre Eugene Gratz Study, 1961

The major issues in business education for the Gratz study were defined primarily by a review of the business education literature from 1950 to 1960, by discussions with business educators, by conferences, panels, seminars, and round-table discussions at conventions, and by personal interviews with selected leaders in business education. These issues were limited to those that seemed to be the most important in shaping policies and practices of business education. Selected business education leaders were then used in the jury technique of refining, clarifying, and supplementing the issues.

The business education leaders were selected by using a mailed questionnaire to 250 public secondary school business teachers throughout the United States. A total of 186 (74.4 percent) of the questionnaires were returned. From this tabulation emerged 40 business education leaders who were used as respondents to the issues. Twenty (50 percent) were interviewed personally and 20 (50 percent) were mailed questionnaires. Thirty-eight (95 percent) of the business education leaders responded to the issues. These responses were tabulated to determine the extent to which the issues involved were controversial.

This study was compared with the similar studies of J. Marshall Hanna (1939) and Carlos K. Hayden (1950) to determine the trends of thought over the past two decades.

The Earl Edward Harris Study, 1965

One of the purposes of the Harris study was to determine the relationship of the reasoned-judgment reactions of office education and distributive education teacher-coordinators, concerning selected issues regarding the

operation of the secondary school cooperative programs, to teacher-coordinator, program, and community characteristics.

An adaptation of the "critical incident technique" was utilized to determine the critical requirements for the job activities of experienced Illinois office education and distributive education teacher-coordinators. The reasoned-judgment reaction questions were used to ascertain and compare the philosophy of the Illinois office education and distributive education teachers regarding selected issues with the responses of distributive education national leaders in 1959 relative to the operation of secondary school cooperative programs.

An analysis and classification of the critical incidents resulted in the formulation of eight major categories of job activities for secondary school office education and distributive education teacher-coordinators: (1) discipline and control of students, (2) selection of training station and placement activities, (3) evaluation and selection of students, (4) personal and professional relationships, (5) adjusting student training station performance problems (employer suggested), (6) adjusting student problems (student suggested), (7) direction of in-school learning activities, and (8) development of promotion of program.

Utilizing the Chi-square statistic, significant differences were found in the patterns of behavior for distributive education teacher-coordinators when compared with the factors of educational preparation, years of experience as coordinators, years of experience as coordinators in their present schools, length of teaching contract, and population of the school district where the teacher-coordinator was employed. No statistically significant differences were found in the patterns of behavior for office education teacher-coordinators; however, the interaction of effective and ineffective behaviors with teacher-coordinators, program, and community factors tended proportionately to favor the coordinators with more experience and educational preparation—a relationship which was also evident in the analysis of distributive education coordinator behaviors. A total of 61 critical requirements was delineated for the distributive education coordinator and 16 for office education teacher-coordinators. The Illinois office education and distributive education teacher-coordinator groups were in closer agreement with each other than either group was with the national leaders of distributive education in 1959 in their responses to a majority of the selected issues concerning the operation of the secondary school cooperative program.

The issues concerning the role of the businessman in effectuating the cooperative program, the enrollment of students with an office or distributive occupational career objective, the necessity of business experience for secondary school students who plan to pursue careers in business, and the frequency with which teacher-coordinators should renew their business experience are not as clearly recognized by Illinois teacher-coordinators as they were by the national leaders of distributive education in 1959. The selected teacher-coordinator, program, and community factors that were analyzed provided additional insight into the reason Illinois teacher-coordinators responded as they did to the 11 issues which were selected for further analysis.

The Bernard C. Nye Study, 1967

The purposes of Nye's study were: (1) to determine the issues relating to distributive teacher education; (2) to determine the major issues relating to teacher education as expressed by distributive education leaders and educational personnel involved in the operation of the distributive teacher education program, and (3) to determine the opinions of leaders in distributive education with respect to the major issues.

The issues identified in the Nye study were obtained by: (1) a review of the literature; (2) discussions with distributive educators, including state supervisors, teacher educators, and research personnel; and (3) discussions heard, as well as conducted, at professional distributive education meetings.

Of the nine persons with whom discussions were held, three were state supervisors, five were teacher educators, and one was a research specialist in distributive education. Thirty-six issues were selected as the most current by the recognized leaders in distributive education. These were presented to the respondents.

In the Nye study, no issue could be acknowledged as being the current most important issue in distributive teacher education; however, 36 initial issues were selected as important by the committee of nine distributive educators participating in the discussion and development of the initial list of issues. The selection of the issues was made on the basis of personal belief and interest in the issue.

Certain background factors did not significantly influence opinions on major issues. No significant relationships were found in connection with geographic region or with the following factors: the number of years of experience in the position, the number of years in education, and the years of full-time work experience in a distributive occupation as experienced by state supervisors and teacher educators. However, factors such as the respondent's position and academic degrees held were significant in some cases.

Of the 36 initial issues identified in the study, 11 indicated that over 80 percent of the respondents were in agreement on the statement. Three other issues indicated that over 70 percent, but less than 80 percent, of the respondents were in agreement; however, a considerable percentage of the respondents indicated their uncertainty in relation to the statement. Eight of the issues indicated that there were definite divergent points of view among the respondents as shown by percentages of positive and negative reactions; however, no specific issue could be considered the most important one in distributive teacher education. The responses given on the remaining 14 issues indicated that a large percentage of the respondents were uncertain, giving the implication that there are divergent points of view and that these issues may also be major issues involved in distributive teacher education.

The study was limited to opinions secured from four selected groups of respondents who had the responsibility for the operation of distributive teacher education programs. These included state supervisors of distributive education, directors of vocational education in state departments of education, distributive teacher educators, and heads of the divisions of the colleges within certain universities having a distributive teacher education

program. A total of 84 questionnaires was mailed to the four groups of respondents in 21 states with 66 responses returned and the data analyszed.

The conflicting points of view among the respondents indicate that additional thought should be given to the contractual agreements between state departments of education and institutions of higher learning for the development and operation of a distributive teacher education program. Amicable agreement is needed as to the specific functions of the teacher education program and the duties and responsibilities to be assumed by the teacher educator. The respondents disagreed as to who has the responsibility for determining professional certification requirements and work experience requirements for teacher-coordinators as well as to who should have the final authority to designate certification approval for teacher-coordinators.

Many of the respondents commented that a cooperative working relationship between the university and the State Department of Education would be highly desirable to provide an effective teacher education program as it related to distributive education within the state.

The Barry L. Reece Study, 1971

Reece's study is specifically related to the issues in adult distributive education. Since the writer will be concerned with this area as it relates to the total program of distributive education, it was felt that this study should be considered.

The purpose of Reece's study was to identify the major issues in adult distributive education and to ascertain the opinions of distributive education leaders toward these issues.

Two principal methods were employed to identify the major issues. The first step involved a review of the literature from 1960 to 1968. From this procedure, 77 tentative issue statements were identified. The second step involved a variation of Q-methodology. The tentative issue statements were printed on three-inch by five-inch cards to form an "Issues" card-sort. This card-sort was submitted to a jury of eight distributive educators.

Forty-two issue statements were identified and listed in multiple-choice form on a check sheet. The issues were divided into four categories: (1) objectives and philosophy, (2) organization and administration, (3) curriculum and related issues, and (4) adult distributive educational instructional staff. The check sheet was sent to the state supervisor of distributive education in each of the 50 states and one teacher educator responsible for distributive education in each of 42 states. Ninety percent of the check sheets submitted were returned in usable form.

The findings present the check sheet statements in original form.

The respondents were also asked to report the importance of each of the issues. Of the 42 issues, there was almost complete agreement (90 percent or more) on 11 issues, indicating that the statements might be considered as principles. A great majority of the respondents (67 to 89 percent) agreed upon 18 of the issues, indicating that these statements might also be considered as principles. There was majority agreement (50 to 66 percent) on seven issues. In this case, statements indicate a trend in favor of one contention. There was a lack of agreement (49 percent or less) on six issues.

Some of the major conclusions were these: (1) Teacher education should provide students majoring in distributive education with instruction in planning, organizing, and promoting adult education programs. (2) The teaching contract which exists between the teacher-coordinator and the local school system should specify responsibility in the area of adult distributive education. (3) In communities served by high school, post-secondary, and adult programs, joint curriculum planning should be undertaken. (4) A specialist in adult distributive education should be employed by the institution responsible for teacher education, or by the state department of public instruction, to assist with adult program development throughout the state.

Other Studies

In addition to the studies which pertain specifically to issues, other studies were found which were indirectly related to this study. The purpose in reviewing the following studies was to assist in indentifying issues in distributive education.

The Glenn O. Emick study (1936) was the first to deal with cooperative training in retail selling and merchandising. The study examines growth and development of cooperative training and determines the results being obtained from classroom instruction coordinated with on-the-job training.

Ironically, many of the challenges which Emick identified in his study are still relevant today and those in the field are still looking for answers.

John E. Gradoni (1957), in a study of distributive education programs in New York state, found that trainee graduates and employers benefited materially as a result of their participation in the cooperative training programs; however, certain conditions had developed which, if not remedied, Gradoni believed would adversely affect future program progress.

Among the conclusions of Gradoni's study were: (1) aims and objectives in distributive education must be restated in terms of more immediate and measurable goals; (2) additional specialization in curriculum content is called for; (3) increased merchant support, adjusted work schedules, and better use of training stations could minimize the problems created by the seasonal nature of retailing; (4) the use of advisory committees should result in better coordination between program activities and community employment needs; (5) the time allotted for coordination duties should be devoted to such work, and school officials should require written coordination reports; and (6) many training station problems could be avoided by the use of written training agreements.

E. Wayne Courtney and Harold H. Halfin (1969) conducted a study to determine common training requirements of secondary level vocational teachers in the five vocational disciplines. One implication of the study was that such commonalities within the five disciplines might constitute a common core of training experiences within broadly based vocational teacher education curriculums.

In a survey conducted by Charles E. Peck (1968), teacher-coordinators were asked to list any major problems which confronted them in the distributive education field or suggestions for improving the present distribu-

tive education picture. All of the problems fell into one of the following categories: (1) attitude of others toward distribution, (2) distributive education standards, (3) qualifications of coordinators, (4) need for better teaching materials and facilities, and (5) legal requirements.

Lucille W. Patton's study (1971), "An Analysis of Curriculum and Employment Needs in Post-Secondary Distributive Education Programs in Oklahoma," was to determine whether middle-management programs should follow the specialization route or continue to be designed as general middle-management programs. One of the recommendations, based upon the findings of the study, indicated that general middle-management programs will more nearly meet preemployment needs than will programs designed for specific retail areas, such as: fashion merchandising; automotive and petroleum marketing; food merchandising; and hotel, motel, and restaurant administration. She concluded that designing a specific program will limit enrollment in post-secondary distributive education programs.

Harold D. Johansen (1963) found in his "Evaluation of Federally Reimbursed Distributive Education Programs in Iowa" that a major weakness of the Iowa distributive education programs, when evaluated in terms of the National Study of Secondary School Evaluation evaluative criteria, 1960 edition, was lack of physical facilities. He also found weaknesses in the organizational pattern, instructional staff, and instructional materials.

In a doctoral study, Galen V. Jones (1957) found that Pennsylvania high school principals believed that coordinator and student contacts with merchants were important factors in improving public relations with the business community. Jones also found that 80 percent of the coordinators received help from school counselors in determining students' aptitudes for training in distribution. Jones concluded that distributive education graduates were the most influential persons in students' decisions to apply for distributive education.

Reno S. Knouse (1962) in the first professional bulletin for the Council for Distributive Teacher Education found that the five aspects of teacher education needing most attention were: (1) more emphasis on experience in coordination activities in practice-teaching programs, (2) more emphasis on all aspects of adult education, (3) more emphasis on occupational experience with greater attention given to college industry-arranged internship experience, (4) more technical distributive education course offerings, and (5) more attention to the development and use of criteria for the selection of prospective distributive education teacher-coordinators.

In 1966, Warren G. Meyer directed a project which dealt with occupational experience and career development. The first phase was a pilot-training project based on directed occupational experience for teachers of distribution and marketing, the purpose of which was to maximize the value of planned occupation experience.

William B. Ruth (1966) conducted a study to determine the factors needed to improve the quality and scope of adult distributive education in Ohio and to identify some of the basic problems faced in the organization and development of adult programs.

Ruth concluded that trade associations and chambers of commerce would be interested in promoting adult distributive education if they had an

explanation of the adult program and if local directors of the programs were active. He further concluded that the prime reason for success of local adult distributive education programs was the fact that the coordinator was devoting more than 10 percent of his time to this aspect of the distributive education program.

Harland E. Samson's (1964) assessment of critical requirements of Iowa distributive education teacher-coordinators revealed eight effective and eight ineffective behaviors in the category, "Direction of Club Program and Project."

Samson listed 25 effective instructional activities, some of which emphasize individualized assistance in learning. Four of the effective behaviors were: (1) counsels with students and provides individual help on problems connected with jobs, training sponsors, or other related action; (2) gives special training to individual students; (3) conducts individual conferences with students on their personal problems or behaviors; (4) counsels with students on educational plans, encouraging them to continue their education and not to drop out.

Samson's study also provided some insight into the nature of the teacher-coordinator's follow-up duties with students.

William F. Bicanich (1964) in a study to determine distributive education students' reactions to the cooperative distributive education program in Minnesota, found that students ranked co-workers, on-the-job supervisors, and on-the-job training very high. Almost 40 percent indicated they received more training and assistance on the job than other part-time workers.

Bicanich also reported that 88 percent of Minnesota high school distributive education students rated the club (DECA) as being important to the distributive education program, and approximately 80 percent of them felt that the club was of personal benefit to them. His study also showed that students belonging to DECA were better satisfied with the distributive education program.

Eugene L. Dorr (1962) included in case studies of weaknesses in coordination practices a case on the failure to make maximum use of training opportunities afforded by the retail classroom laboratory. He theorized that this failure provides a clue to an important problem in relation to physical facilities.

Six of the 14 case problems on weaknesses in coordination practices collected by Dorr related to situations on the job—two pertained to planned coordination calls, two to training sponsors, and two to the selection of training stations.

Edward E. Scannel (1963) investigated off-campus responsibilities of distributive teacher educators. Included among his findings relating to off-campus professional activities were: (1) more than half of the respondents offered professional courses for credit off-campus; (2) over 90 percent scheduled individual visitations to their coordinators; (3) in-service education was conducted by 91.3 percent; (4) local schools were visited by 95.6 percent; (5) approximately 74 percent had responsibility for off-campus student teachers in distributive education; (6) nearly 70 percent participated in checking the effectiveness of their high school programs; and (7) almost all (95.6 percent) were involved with coordinators' conferences.

An exploratory study by James A Zancanella (1965) sought to determine whether there were important differences in selected criteria between distributive occupations employees who had participated as distributive education students and employees who had not participated in such a program during high school. No significant differences were found in types of employment firms, titles of positions, main job functions performed, job performance ratings, reasons for changing employment, and salary. Significant differences did exist in intentions to remain in their present type of work.

Chester O. Mills (1964) compared the academic achievement of distributive education cooperative program participants with comparable students on the basis of normative data, including mental maturity test scores, class rank, grade averages, and drop-out rates.

Mills found that the participants in the cooperative program showed a greater tendency to complete high school than their fellow students. However, the mental maturity scores and class ranks of the cooperative students were low, with more than 70 percent in the lower half of their graduating classes.

Harland E. Samson's study (1969), "The Nature and Characteristics of Middle-Management in Retail Department Stores," attempted to provide answers to some of the more basic questions about middle-management personnel, their work, their characteristics and qualities, and the preferred source of educational preparation.

This study determined that approximately 9.7 percent of the employees in a firm were middle managers. Also established was the fact that the general rate of turnover of middle managers was approximately 15.2 percent per year. Using these figures, needs for middle managers were projected for each region of the nation. The supply of middle managers was estimated after considering data on secondary schools, their programs, and their graduates.

Samson concluded that there is little merit in having a specialized middle-management curriculum for the retail department store industry, and that general marketing majors with a few appropriate electives would adequately serve to meet the expectations of department store employers. The analysis of the desired characteristics of potential department store middle managers indicates that courses developing broad business perspectives and generalizable skills would be favored over those which are narrower in scope and specific to routine retail skills.

Kenneth Ertel (1966) designed a study to: (1) develop a research instrument to identify the major tasks and associated knowledges necessary for successful employment in the merchandising operations of modern retail firms; and (2) analyze the knowledges necessary to perform the major tasks in the retail field in order to identify the clusters of concepts common to all the vocational fields and conversely, to isolate those concepts unique to the field studied. Specifically, he attempted to identify tasks for department stores, limited price variety stores, and general merchandise stores; 33 firms and 900 employees were sampled. The sample included both supervisory and non-supervisory personnel. Tasks were categorized under: (1) selling; (2) keeping and counting stock; (3) operating checkstand and sales register;

(4) receiving, checking, and marking merchandise; (5) delivery; (6) keeping accounts and records; (7) computing information using mathematical skills; (8) planning and arranging interior and window displays; (9) planning, preparing, and placing advertisements; (10) buying merchandise for resale; (11) pricing merchandise; and (12) controlling merchandise. There were 332 tasks listed in the 12 categories.

Ertel found discrepancies in the type of work actually done and the content of some distributive education programs in King and Pierce Counties in the state of Washington. The conclusion drawn was that students should be helped to adapt to a broad range of tasks. There was only a slight chance of moving into supervisory positions without some post-secondary training. Another finding was that tasks involving technical aspects of planning, preparing, and placing advertisements, and most display activities are performed by a limited number of in-store or commercial specialists; thus, more emphasis should be placed on the coordinating of these tasks than the technical aspects. A fourth conclusion was that in high school programs aimed at preparing non-supervisory college bound youth for entry positions in merchandising divisions, the major emphasis should be on selling, stock-keeping, and cashiering competencies. Other skills are inherent in these tasks such as basic skills and human relations.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE DATA

The procedures used in this research include the following:

1. Identifying the issues.
2. Refining the issues and organizing a tentative check sheet.
3. Identifying the leaders.
4. Determining the response to the leadership questionnaire.
5. Tabulating the frequency of the respondents' nominations.
6. Selecting the leaders.
7. Pretesting the issues check sheet.
8. Conducting the pilot study.
9. Preparing the final issues check sheet.
10. Submitting the issues check sheet.

The Issues Check Sheet was divided into four sections:

1. Philosophy
2. Organization and Administration
3. Teacher Education
4. Curriculum and Related Issues

These issues are presented in this chapter. First, the check sheet statement is presented. The number and percentage of the respondents who selected each response are listed. The check sheet statement responses are analyzed. Selected comments made by the respondents are recorded. Finally, the respondents' opinions about the importance of the issue are reported. The number and percentage of the respondents who check each of the choices—"critical," "very important," "important," "little importance," or "no importance"—are recorded. Directions to the leaders included the statement: "By definition, an issue would be considered crucial if a decision concerning it would significantly affect the operation and administration of the distributive education program."

Section I: Philosophy

Nineteen issue statements are concerned with the philosophy of distributive education. An analysis of these issues follows.

1. **CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—The following agency(ies) should be responsible for adult distributive education:**

24 (80 percent)	a.	state distributive education department and the local distributive education personnel.
2 (7 percent)	b.	the institution of higher learning under the auspices of the state board for higher education.

4 (13 percent)	c.	the local board of education.
None	d.	an agency outside the school such as the Retail Merchants Association, Sales and Marketing Executives, Chamber of Commerce, etc.

Analysis and Comments.—Eighty percent of the respondents agree that the responsibility for adult distributive education should rest with the state distributive education department and the local distributive education personnel. Several of the respondents express a concern for cooperation among the various agencies and the distributive education department. Richard Ashmun indicates that "there should be close cooperation with outside agencies. Currently, this is a critical area of need—enrollments have dropped." Neal Vivian comments in a similar vein: "The distributive education state department is ultimately responsible for all facets of the program, but should cooperate with local agencies." In further agreement with the majority, Warren Meyer states, "Distributive education must be in charge of adult distributive education if this program is to serve the community well. It requires segmented marketing, promotional techniques, and highly relevant curriculum."

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	12	(40 percent)
b.	Very important	11	(36.7 percent)
c.	Important	6	(20 percent)
d.	Little importance	1	(3.3 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

Forty percent of the leaders indicate the issue to be "critical," while 36.7 percent believe it to be "very important." One respondent is emphatically convinced that "the promotion of adult distributive education courses is one of the most complex challenges facing the program. It deserves a national conference."

2. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—Distributive education should be offered primarily on:

None	a.	the secondary level
None	b.	the post-secondary level (13 and 14 year).
30 (100 percent)	c.	both the secondary and the post-secondary levels.

Analysis and Comments.—One hundred percent of the leaders believe that distributive education should be offered at both the secondary and post-secondary levels.

Commenting on this statement is Edwin Nelson: "Availability of instruction is essential to career development needs of people. No one level of instruction should be recognized as being sufficient to sustain a career in marketing." The leaders tend to agree that there is too much to be taught at only one level. They feel that instruction should be sequenced from high

school to post-secondary level to eliminate repetition of the high school curriculum at the post-secondary level.

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	22	(73.4 percent)
b.	Very important	7	(23.3 percent)
c.	Important	0	(0 percent)
d.	Little importance	0	(0 percent)
e.	No importance	1	(3.3 percent)

The leaders concur in thinking this is "critical" in importance. Ninety-six percent of the respondents list the issue as either "critical" or "very important." However, Ken Ertel disagrees: "I don't see this as an issue. The issue is long since resolved. It is now only an administrative and operational problem."

3. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—The post-secondary program in distributive education should primarily:

2 (6 percent)	a.	offer a general program in marketing and distribution.
23 (77 percent)	b.	offer specialized programs in specific areas of marketing and distribution.
5 (17 percent)		More than one response

Analysis and Comments.—Seventy-seven percent of the distributive educators responding to this statement indicate that the post-secondary program in distributive education should primarily offer specialized programs in specific areas of marketing and distribution.

Five of the leaders checked both of the alternatives. David Thompson believes that it is "entirely practical for a mid-management program and specialized programs to be successful on the same campus." Mildred Jackson supplements Thompson's remarks, saying: "The non-high school distributive education students *must* have the general program, while others need specialized areas to meet determined objectives." Harland Samson strikes a medium: "We should have both general and specialized programs; however, if there is but one choice, the general program should prevail because of service to a larger number of people."

On the other hand, two of the respondents feel generalization at this level would be a waste of valuable time. "The specialized programs tend to be more vocationally oriented," asserts Richard Ashmun, and Edwin Nelson further comments: "Maturation of career objectives would suggest product areas as well as specific marketing activities, such as advertising, management, etc. (including enterprise formation)."

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	9	(30 percent)
b.	Very important	12	(40 percent)
c.	Important	9	(30 percent)
d.	Little importance	0	(0 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

The fact that there is 100 percent agreement that the issue is important seems significant.

4. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—Specialized programs in distributive education should be offered primarily on:

None	a.	the secondary level.
14 (47 percent)	b.	the post-secondary level (13th and 14th years).
16 (53 percent)	c.	both the secondary and post-secondary levels.

Analysis and Comments.—The largest portion of those responding agree that specialized programs in distributive education should be offered at both the secondary and post-secondary levels. In expressing an opinion with the majority, Mary Marks replies: "Specialized programs should represent clusters, not single jobs, and should be organized so that levels of achievement expected are in a continuum. They encourage relevance and are strong motivators." Along the same lines, Edwin Nelson notes: "Considering first, student needs and interests, program options should include specializations at all levels of instruction." Eugene Dorr goes on to add that "distributive education must expand at the secondary level with specialized programs in order to gain the greatest growth and respect."

Forty-seven percent of the leaders indicate that specialized programs in distributive education should be offered primarily on the post-secondary level. Several of these individuals believe that some specialized programs should be offered at the high school level. For example, Mary Klaurens suggests that: "There should be 'some' specialized programs in high schools that serve a large distributive education enrollment. Homogeneous grouping by occupational interests and goals allows for provision of more relevant instruction."

Peter Haines asserts:

> In our society and educational system with a lack of career counseling (K-8) and parent desires for further education, I doubt if many pupils in the high school have sufficient knowledge to enter a highly specialized program within distributive education. Some surely would profit, but how many might suffer immobility?

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	5	(16.7 percent)
b.	Very important	16	(53.3 percent)
c.	Important	9	(30 percent)
d.	Little importance	0	(0 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

While 30 percent feel it to be "important," the majority of the respondents mark this item as "very important." Only 16.7 percent believe it to be "critical."

5. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—Students given the highest priority for enrollment in distributive education should be:

3 (10 percent)	a.	low ability youth with special needs.
3 (10 percent)	b.	high ability youth with special needs.
17 (57 percent)	c.	the readily employable youth who desire immediate employment after high school graduation.
1 (3 percent)	d.	youth whose career goals require a four-year college degree.
4 (13 percent)		No response
2 (7 percent)		More than one response.

Analysis and Comments.—Most of those responding to this statement believe that the students given the highest priority for enrollment in distributive education should be the readily employable youth who desire immediate employment after high school graduation. Edwin Nelson, representative of this point of view, cautions: "To indicate that the program is responsive to the needs of the major segment of the student body is not to deny the importance of serving youth with special needs or those planning further education." Furthermore, several other respondents suggest that distributive education should be serving all students who can profit from, need, and desire instruction in the program.

Edward Ferguson expresses a somewhat different viewpoint. "Without the availability of a high school training program," he states, "most youth with special needs will never become a productive part of society." Mary Marks concurs: "Highest priorities should be given those students who can profit from instruction with or without special services or modified activities."

Six leaders respond either with more than one alternative or with none at all.

Eugene Dorr indicates that "the greatest need is a career interest in marketing, merchandising, and management. All those having this interest should have a high priority."

Generally agreed is that distributive education should serve *all* people with a career interest in marketing and distribution. Another corollary reflection is that interest and potential for benefiting from instruction is more critical than students' abilities.

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	14	(50 percent)
b.	Very important	8	(28 percent)
c.	Important	3	(11 percent)
d.	Little importance	3	(11 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

The respondents' principal contention is that the issue ranks as "critical" in importance.

6. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—Students given the least priority for enrollment in distributive education should be:

2 (7 percent)	a.	low ability youth with special needs.
None	b.	high ability youth with special needs.
2 (7 percent)	c.	the readily employable youth who desire immediate employment after high school graduation.
22 (73 percent)	d.	youth whose career goals require a four-year college degree.
4 (13 percent)		No response.

Analysis and Comments.—The leaders responding to this statement are in accord that students given the least priority for enrollment in distributive education should be youth whose career goals require a four-year college degree.

Though concurring with the majority, Lucy Crawford elaborates thusly: "This does not indicate that youth who plan to go to a four-year college should be excluded from the distributive education program." Conversely, others hold that the youth who are planning to go to college could develop the necessary competencies for success without the help of distributive education. As Edwin Nelson puts it:

> Judgments regarding the enrollment of college-bound youth should be made in terms of curriculum objectives and the significance of the attainment of such objectives to a degree program.

The individuals selecting other alternatives suggest that distributive education is not necessarily good for low ability youth unless some other factors indicate that they can benefit from the instruction.

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	6	(20 percent)
b.	Very important	7	(23 percent)
c.	Important	14	(47 percent)
d.	Little importance	1	(3 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)
	No response	2	(7 percent)

Those responding contend primarily that this item is "important."

7. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—Distributive education students should be paid for their on-the-job training on the basis of:

25 (83 percent)	a.	the same salary as paid to any part-time employee.
4 (14 percent)	b.	a higher salary than paid a student not in a training program.
1 (3 percent)	c.	a lesser salary than paid a student not in a training program.

Analysis and Comments.—Most of the leaders agree that distributive education students should be paid the same salary for their on-the-job training as that paid to any part-time employee. Mary Marks lends her support to this near-unanimous opinion: "In a good program, the benefits of supervision and training are fringe wages not available to most part-time employees."

However, in defense of a minority viewpoint, Ron Strand believes that "if we are truly training, then our distributive education students should be of greater value." Edward Ferguson agrees with Strand and adds: "If the employer does not view the student as being worth more, then the training program is adding nothing to the student's ability."

	Importance of this issue		
a.	Critical	4	(13 percent)
b.	Very important	13	(43 percent)
c.	Important	10	(34 percent)
d.	Little importance	3	(10 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

Most of the leaders contend that this issue is "very important," followed by the secondary contention of "important."

8. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—The primary responsibility of distributive education at the secondary level should be:

4 (13 percent)	a.	to prepare students for entry level positions in general areas of marketing and distribution.
2 (7 percent)	b.	to prepare students for specialization in certain areas in marketing and distribution.
22 (73 percent)	c.	to prepare most students for entry level positions in general areas as well as preparing for specialized areas where facilities are adequate.
2 (7 percent)	d.	to prepare students to continue in a post-secondary distributive education program.

Analysis and Comments.—A substantial majority of the leaders believe the primary responsibility of distributive education at the secondary level should be to prepare most studnets for entry level positions in general areas, as well as to prepare for specialized areas where facilities are adequate. Some, like David Thompson, feel that specialization can be accommodated in general programs of distributive education. Thompson asserts:

> If properly administered by the teacher-coordinator, 'group instruction' provides general skills and 'individualized instruction' provides skills necessary for success in a preselected specific career objective.

Speaking for the minority, Edwin Nelson notes:

> I am not sure that general *areas* of employment can be equated with specialized areas of employment. Once employed,

that employment becomes 'specialized.' Even in a diversified occupations class, students ought to be prepared for a specific area of marketing employment.

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	6	(20 percent)
b.	Very important	16	(53 percent)
c.	Important	8	(27 percent)
d.	Little importance	0	(0 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

This issue is primarily considered a "very important" one. A significant percentage, however, feel it to be merely "important;" on the other hand, almost the same number check "critical."

9. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—The primary responsibility of distributive education at the post-secondary or technical level should be:

16 (53 percent)	a.	to prepare students for mid-management positions in general areas of marketing and distribution.
14 (47 percent)	b.	to prepare students for specialization in certain areas of marketing and distribution.

Analysis and Comments.—Although the leaders were divided in opinion between the two available choices, a slight majority felt that the primary responsibility of distributive education at the post-secondary or technical level should be to prepare students for mid-management positions in general areas of marketing and distribution.

Edward Harris states that:

> Post-secondary programs should be comprehensive enough to provide all types of programs—specialized programs provide the student with better opportunity for employment.

Reno Knouse emphasizes:

> Specialization should be the primary responsibility, but the need to prepare students for mid-management positions in general areas is also highly important. High schools and post-secondary schools have the primary responsibility of offering the kinds of education needed by the members of the community regardless of the nature of this education.

Peter Haines goes further to mention a primary debility of general objectives: "All too often the programs with general objectives prove to be academic not only in course requirements but also in teaching practice."

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	9	(30 percent)
b.	Very important	9	(30 percent)

c.	Important	11	(37 percent)
d.	Little importance	1	(3 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

The leaders are divided three ways on a nearly even scale in their opinions about the issue's importance. Carrying equal weight are the categories "important," "very important," and "critical."

10. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—The DECA program of youth activities should be:

None	a.	viewed as an extracurricular activity and not included in the curriculum.
30 (100 percent)	b.	viewed as a cocurricular activity.
None	c.	completely disregarded.

Analysis and Comments.—There is unanimous agreement on this statement. All 30 leaders unanimously declare that the DECA program of youth activities should be viewed as a cocurricular activity.

Ken Ertel correctly assesses the situation with this statement: "The issue is not how DECA should be used but *how extensively* it should be used." And the total effectiveness of DECA's role is quite adequately summed up by Edwin Nelson. "Through DECA, students have an opportunity to be self-directive in satisfying career development needs. DECA enriches and complements the instructional program."

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	14	(47 percent)
b.	Very important	10	(33 percent)
c.	Important	4	(13 percent)
d.	Little importance	2	(7 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

The respondents are divided in opinion about the issue's importance. In order of their frequency of selection, the choices are "critical," "very important," and "important."

11. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—The competitive activities in the high school division of DECA should be:

19 (63 percent)	a.	open to all members of DECA, with cooperative students competing with non-cooperative students.
11 (37 percent)	b.	open to all members of DECA, with competition limited to cooperative students competing with cooperative students and non-cooperative students competing with non-cooperative students.
None	c.	limited to the cooperative students only.

Analysis and Comments.—A majority of respondents contend that the competitive activities in the high school division of DECA should be open to all members of DECA, with cooperative students competing with non-cooperative students.

In support of this affirmation, the following comments are on record: "If our goal is 'employability', then any member should have the opportunity to participate in his division's activities." (Harry Applegate); "If DECA is an extension of the instructional program into a student dominated environment, then its activities should not be controlled by the program's method of instruction." (Edwin L. Nelson); "The cooperative plan is exactly that—a way of providing instruction to meet goals. There is no magic which suggests a student under this plan is to be more privileged than one who is under another plan of instruction." (Peter Haines)

Several respondents reflect that if outcomes of both programs are the same and the DECA activities are worthwhile, then they should be available to all students competing together.

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	8	(27 percent)
b.	Very important	15	(50 percent)
c.	Important	5	(17 percent)
d.	Little importance	2	(6 percent)
e.	No imporance	0	(0 percent)

Seventy-seven percent believe the issue to be at least "very important."

12. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—The need for career orientation and exploration programs at the K-10 level can best be met by:

18 (60 percent)	a.	vocational education.
9 (30 percent)	b.	general education.
1 (3 percent)		No response
2 (7 percent)		More than one response.

Analysis and Comments.—The majority of the distributive educators indicate that the need for career orientation and exploration programs at the K-10 level can best be met by vocational education.

Ken Ertel, listing both choices, alleges:

> Neither sector has the teachers, philosophy, curriculum competence to do the job. A whole new pattern of teacher competencies and especially trained teachers must be generated. This is one of the least understood issues in education, yet many people are proposing limited answers without really exploring the question fully. This may be our most important current issue.

Lucy Crawford is quoted as believing that "vocational educators can best design the learning experiences needed for career orientation and exploration programs. However, I feel that separate funding should be made for such programs to protect the funds for vocational education."

Interestingly, Edward Harris observes that the best way to implement the career education concept is to work on a team basis. On the other hand, Eugene Dorr, Mary Klaurens, and Neal Vivian express similar viewpoints, noting that career orientation and exploration programs at the K-10 level can best be met by general education. They affirm, nevertheless, that distributive educators must provide help, direction, and advice on the structure, scope, and manpower needs.

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	17	(57 percent)
b.	Very important	10	(33 percent)
c.	Important	3	(3 percent)
d.	Little importance	0	(0 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

That only two other issue statements received more "critical" votes is indicative of the importance of this issue. A large majority of the respondents list this statement as "critical" or "very important."

13. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—The present activities of DECA are effectively accomplishing the stated goals of the organization.

5 (17 percent)	a.	Strongly agree
14 (47 percent)	b.	Agree
8 (27 percent)	c.	Uncertain
1 (3 percent)	d.	Disagree
2 (6 percent)	e.	Strongly disagree

Analysis and Comments.—The responses are divided among the alternatives. The majority are in accord that the present activities of DECA are effectively accomplishing the stated goals of the organization. Thirty-seven percent, however, are either uncertain or in disagreement.

David Thompson responds to this issue in somewhat ambivalent terms: "I generally agree, but I feel very strongly that, as we get larger, it is going to become increasingly important to coldly and deliberately evaluate every proposed national DECA project. Impulsiveness must go!"

"This is one of the most critical issues in the DECA program," Neal Vivian explains, disagreeing with the stated assertion. "It is my observation that the way most chapter activities are being carried out that too few students are actually involved, and as a result many students are deprived of maximum benefit of the DECA program."

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	8	(27 percent)
b.	Very important	12	(40 percent)
c.	Important	8	(27 percent)
d.	Little importance	2	(6 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

Divided responses meet concerning the importance of this issue. As may be readily observed, the plurality contention is "very important." Next in order of selection, "critical" and "important" draw identical response.

14. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—A written training plan (an outline of the distributive education trainee's learning experiences) is necessary to insure optimum training.

None	a.	Never
None	b.	Seldom
8 (27 percent)	c.	Usually
22 (73 percent)	d.	Always

Analysis and Comments.—The major portion of the respondents believe that a written training plan is necessary to insure optimum training. Warren Meyer points out that the training plan serves very useful educational and psychological purposes even when it seems to be only a formality. Edwin Nelson is supportive of this approach. "A documentation of learning experiences is necessary for an effective evaluation of competency development." Eugene Dorr also establishes that the expansion of "work experience" demands that cooperative education keep the training plan. In short, many respondents see the training plan as the key to the instructional program.

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	16	(54 percent)
b.	Very important	10	(33 percent)
c.	Important	4	(13 percent)
d.	Little importance	0	(0 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

The majority of the educators concur that this issue is, indeed, a "critical" one. The secondary contention is that the item is "very important."

15. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—A written training plan should be required and signed by every distributive education cooperative student.

18 (60 percent)	a.	Strongly agree
7 (23 percent)	b.	Agree
1 (3 percent)	c.	Uncertain
2 (7 percent)	d.	Disagree
2 (7 percent)	e.	Strongly disagree

Analysis and Comments.—The majority of the respondents are in strong agreement that a written training plan should be required and signed by every distributive education cooperative student.

Two respondents declare that the training plan is necessary to make certain the student understands the objectives toward which he is working.

Edwin Nelson upholds this view. "Such documentation," he states, "gives direction to the employment experience and increases student understanding of the role of his job in relation to his instructional program."

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	13	(43 percent)
b.	Very important	13	(43 percent)
c.	Important	4	(14 percent)
d.	Little importance	0	(0 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

The respondents are once again divided in their opinions about the importance of this issue. An equal number consider the issue "critical" and "very important."

16. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—A training agreement should be required for every distributive education student and signed by the coordinator, employer, and student.

16	(53 percent)	a.	Strongly agree
9	(30 percent)	b.	Agree
3	(10 percent)	c.	Uncertain
2	(7 percent)	d.	Disagree
None		e.	Strongly disagree

Analysis and Comments.—More than half of those surveyed strongly feel that a training agreement should be required for every distributive education student and signed by the coordinator, employer, and student. Warren Meyer comments: "Businessmen respect businesslike practices as well as do other parties. It helps to clarify responsibilities." Some respondents disagree, however, regarding the training agreement as more of a communication tool than a legal or binding contract. Reno Knouse, for example, rejoins: "All should understand and agree, which is more important than affixing signatures."

Some uncertainty is expressed by Lucy Crawford who cautions: "It has been my experience that the time and effort involved in this activity might be utilized to better advantage."

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	7	(23 percent)
b.	Very important	13	(43 percent)
c.	Important	10	(34 percent)
d.	Little importance	0	(0 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

Opinions on the importance of this issue are divided among "very important," "important," and "critical."

17. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—Distributive education teacher-coordinators should be required to renew (or supplement) their occupational experience:

2	(7 percent)	a.	never.
1	(3 percent)	b.	each year.
14	(47 percent)	c.	every 3-5 years.
6	(20 percent)	d.	every 5-7 years
3	(10 percent)	e.	every 7-10 years.
3	(10 percent)		No response
1	(3 percent)		More than one response

Analysis and Comments.—The majority of the leaders responding to this statement agree that distributive education teacher-coordinators should be required to renew (or supplement) their occupational experience every three to five years.

There is a wide variation in some of the comments by the leaders. Fairchild Carter propounds that the occupational experience should be renewed each year, "provided they are serving as occupational consultants and staying active, perhaps never need other employment as an operational level employee." Along the same lines, Lucy Crawford replies that this experience should take the form of "directed observation" rather than productive (paid) employment.

Most of the leaders note that renewing this experience is necessary, due to the rapidly changing field of distribution, and that some provision needs to be made to keep the teachers current.

Reno Knouse explains his position:

> Each year is not necessary. Every three to ten years would be more practical. I am sure there is no magic number of years for this. However, I advocate a state plan for stipends to be paid to teacher-coordinators who are "employed" as "observers" in distributive occupations. These so-called observers might also perform the duties of specific jobs.

"Much depends on the quality and quantity of their initial experience," Warren Meyer emphasizes. "Some should have it every year because they were poorly prepared at the outset. Much research is needed in this area."

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	7	(23 percent)
b.	Very important	11	(38 percent)
c.	Important	7	(23 percent)
d.	Little importance	3	(10 percent)
e.	No importance	1	(3 percent)
	No response	1	(3 percent)

Yet another wide variation in opinions exists regarding the importance of this issue. The primary contention is that the issue is "very important." The secondary contention is equally divided between "critical" and "important."

18. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—Adult distributive education should:

None	a.	be provided only where the community recognizes a need and asks for instruction.
None	b.	be developed wherever the need is apparent to management.
30 (100 percent)	c.	be offered when and where needs can be identified and appropriate program developed.

Analysis and Comments.—All the respondents affirm that adult distributive education should be offered when and where needs can be identified and appropriate programs developed. David Thompson expresses his concern about the importance of this area: "Needs are rampant everywhere, but employers cannot be expected to respond to unskilled 'promoters'."

Peter Haines reflects: "Too often a community relies only on requests, and these are seldom forthcoming from those who don't know or are timid in expressing their needs. Educators should lead, not follow."

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	11	(37 percent)
b.	Very important	12	(40 percent)
c.	Important	6	(20 percent)
d.	Little importance	1	(3 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

The respondents hold varied opinions on this issue, a major portion deciding it to be "very important," followed by "critical" and "important."

19. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—Local programs of distributive education should be financed by:

2 (7 percent)	a.	blanket reimbursement for all programs.
14 (47 percent)	b.	incentive reimbursement—based upon the degree to which desirable program standards are met.
13 (43 percent)	c.	reimbursement for only those activities that are not typically financed by local school districts such as: travel allowances, extended service contracts, etc.

Analysis and Comments—That distributive education programs should be financed by incentive reimbursement, based upon the degree to which desirable program standards are met, receives the most support; this alternative, however, is followed closely by the opinion that local distributive education programs should be financed by reimbursement for only those activities that are not typically financed by local school districts.

Though Reno Knouse makes no response to this statement, he does offer the following comment: "I advocate reimbursement for new programs, or innovative programs. This should be done for only the first two years on a decreasing percentage basis and then the local school districts should assume the full financial responsibility."

Ken Ertel expresses this concern: "There is a great danger of modifying programs to fit funding needs rather than developing programs that fit the needs of students and schools."

Neal Vivian and Richard Ashmun indicate the incentive and reward system should be used to help upgrade the quality of programs and insure program effectiveness—especially in light of the emphasis on assessment and accountability. Mary Marks, also favoring the incentive approach to funding, makes the following assertion: "We must recognize that district budgets are limited but that the school should provide equal educational opportunity and availability of desired disciplines."

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	10	(33 percent)
b.	Very important	14	(47 percent)
c.	Important	6	(20 percent)
d.	Little importance	0	(0 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

More leaders chose the alternative "very important" than any other. The second most selected response is "critical," and the third, "important."

Section II: Organization and Administration

Fourteen issue statements (Items 20 through 33 on the check-sheet) about organization and administration were analyzed.

20. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—The student placement activities of the distributive education teacher-coordinator should include:

16	(53 percent)	a.	jobs in distribution for only those students enrolled in the distributive education cooperative program.
14	(47 percent)	b.	jobs in distribution for the total school placement program.
None		c.	the total school placement program regardless of the placement area.

Analysis and Comments.—Division in response can be readily observed. The opinion that student placement activities of the distributive education teacher-coordinator should include jobs in distribution for only those students enrolled in the distributive education cooperative program receives the most support; but this only narrowly edged out the alternative that the

placement activities should include jobs in distribution for the total school placement program.

In support of choice (a), Todd Sagraves notes that "the typical coordinator has his hands full with just his cooperative students. To act as a placement bureau, the coordinator certainly takes time from his basic responsibilities." Edwin Nelson stresses overall objectives in this regard. "While serving as distributive education teacher-coordinator, placement should be in terms of accomplishing instructional objectives. This is not to say, however, that a teacher-coordinator could not carry two or more assignments, one of which being a placement officer." Peter Haines comments: "What better way than to use alternatives 'b' or 'c' which are low cost to bring about low quality."

In defense of the second choice, the following comments summarize major positions on the issue: "It would be to the advantage of the distributive education program, if adequate time and secretarial help were included in the contract, for D.E. coordinators to handle all placement activities except those handled by other cooperative programs." (Lucy Crawford); "The new coordinator should confine his activities to placement of only students enrolled in the distributive education program until the image of his program is established. The experienced coordinator should truly become a specialist in distribution in his community." (Edward Harris)

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	9	(30 percent)
b.	Very important	12	(40 percent)
c.	Important	8	(27 percent)
d.	Little importance	1	(3 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

Most leaders hold this issue to be "very important." A significantly lower number deem it "critical" or merely "important."

21. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—Classroom instruction, with simulated in-school laboratory job experiences, is adequate preparation for a secondary school student who plans a career in a distributive occupation.

None		a.	Never
14	(47 percent)	b.	Seldom
13	(43 percent)	c.	Usually
None		d.	Always
3	(10 percent)		No response

Analysis and Comments—More of the leaders indicate that classroom instruction with simulated in-school laboratory job experience is seldom adequate preparation for a student planning a career in a distributive occupation.

Lucy Crawford, Ken Rowe, and Mary Marks feel that the projects should include some work experience related to instructional units when

appropriate. Mary Klaurens reports: "In-school laboratory job experiences are adequate for entry level positions, but are not as effective as cooperative training." Richard Ashmun concurs with Klaurens: "Simulated job experiences are helpful as preparation for cooperative experience, but should not be treated as a substitute for sound occupational experience. In some cases, it may be all a student can get and is better than nothing at all."

Neal Vivian is emphatically convinced on the issue, as he affirms:

> Distribution is a 'people oriented' occupation. In many occupations, we can simulate in a school or laboratory an actual job situation. We cannot effectively do this with customers. To be *really* effective, a distributive education program should make provisions for some type of *actual* experiences on *real* jobs.

In further support of the project plan, Edwin Nelson adds: "More reliance must be placed on instructional capability of teachers to bring about employment skills; laboratory experiences must be conceived to supplement that effort."

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	11	(37 percent)
b.	Very important	10	(33 percent)
c.	Important	7	(23 percent)
d.	Little importance	0	(0 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)
	No response	2	(7 percent)

Listed in order of the frequency of selection, the alternatives are "critical," "very important," and "important."

22. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—Coordination in school systems with more than one cooperative distributive education program should:

1	(3 percent)	a.	be done by a person (or staff of coordinators) from a central office.
28	(94 percent)	b.	be done by the person who teaches the student.
1	(3 percent)		No response

Analysis and Comments.—A heavy majority of the leaders express opinion that coordination in school systems with more than one cooperative program should be done by the person who teaches the student. K. Otto Logan agrees with the majority but suggests that the coordination be done in concert with the other coordinators. "When employment is recognized as part of the instructional program," Edwin Nelson adds, there should be no question about who does the coordination." As Mary Marks explains it, "coordination is a method of instruction, assessment, and development in a cooperative program."

In lone opposition to majority opinion, Reno Knouse conceives that in large cities it is usually necessary for the coordination to be done by a staff of coordinators from a central office due to the number of teachers and students involved.

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	15	(50 percent)
b.	Very important	9	(30 percent)
c.	Important	6	(20 percent)
d.	Little importance	0	(0 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

One-half of the respondents list this issue as being "critical." The second-place opinion is "very important."

23. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—In an ideal situation, the teacher-coordinator should visit the student-trainee on the job (or his training sponsor) at least:

None		a.	twice a week.
2	(7 percent)	b.	once a week.
18	(60 percent)	c.	once every two weeks.
8	(26 percent)	d.	once a month.
2	(7 percent)		No response

Analysis and Comments.—A large portion of the respondents say that in an ideal situation the teacher-coordinator should visit the student-trainee on the job at least once every two weeks. Two of the leaders disagree strongly and are of the opinion that there is no set frequency for training station visitations; consequently, these did not respond to the alternatives given.

Edward Harris, supporting the majority views, emphasizes that "this should be geared to the situation, need of student, firm, and experience of the coordinator." And Edwin Nelson reflects: "The scheduling of visits is of less importance than the performance of pertinent activities at the time of the call."

Several qualify their answers, stressing that visitations should be more frequent in the beginning of the training period and then taper off to once every three or four weeks.

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	6	(20 percent)
b.	Very important	13	(43 percent)
c.	Important	8	(27 percent)
d.	Little importance	2	(7 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)
	No response	1	(3 percent)

The predominant feeling of the respondents is that this statement is "very important." The secondary opinion is that the issue is "important."

24. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—Final selection of students for the distributive education program should be made by:

10	(33 percent)	a.	the coordinator after the students have been recommended by the guidance department.
None		b.	the guidance department.
6	(20 percent)	c.	a committee composed of vocational teachers and guidance and administrative personnel.
13	(44 percent)	d.	the coordinator exclusively.
1	(3 percent)		No response

Analysis and Comments.—The leaders are divided in their opinions about *final* selection of students for the distributive education program. The largest number indicate that *final* selection should be done by the coordinator exclusively. The next response is that final selection should be made by the coordinator after the students have been recommended by the guidance department.

Several comments are made regarding this statement. Ken Ertel, while not responding, states: "Why not have components of distributive education that will serve *all* students. Let students select the appropriate part of the distributive education offerings." And Mary Marks observes: "The coordinator should select distributive education offerings which promise successful completion of a student's program. There should be available 'programs' tailored for levels of need as well as entry occupational objectives."

Although agreeing the final selection should be left to the coordinator exclusively, Edward Ferguson raises this pertinent question: "Should there be any selection factors involved when it comes to providing an education for young people?" Todd Sagraves notes: "People other than the distributive education coordinator can be extremely helpful in the selection process."

Neal Vivian indicates that "the coordinator is the best prepared person for this responsibility. Further, he must live with the decisions for the entire time the students are in the program."

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	9	(30 percent)
b.	Very important	16	(53 percent)
c.	Important	2	(7 percent)
d.	Little importance	3	(10 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

The majority of the respondents consider this issue "very important," followed by "critical."

25. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—Assuming that on-the-job experience is required, the experience:

None	a.	need not be coordinated by a teacher-coordinator or coordinator.

29	(97 percent)	b.	must be coordinated by a teacher-coordinator or coordinator
1	(3 percent)		No response

Analysis and Comments.—There is almost unanimous agreement that the on-the-job training experience must be coordinated by a teacher-coordinator or coordinator.

On this issue statement, Reno Knouse makes the comment: "While students can benefit from work experience without coordination, greater gains can be assured with the help of a coordinator."

And Edwin Nelson reemphasizes: "The teacher-coordinator is responsible for the total learning environment of the student."

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	22	(73 percent)
b.	Very important	4	(14 percent)
c.	Important	2	(7 percent)
d.	Little importance	1	(3 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)
	No response	1	(3 percent)

The leaders feel that this issue is "critical." The leaders' second most frequent choice is "very important."

26. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—A classroom with laboratory facilities such as a display unit, sales counter, cash register, etc. is:

None		a.	for the student who receives on-the-job training.
None		b.	for the student who does not receive on-the-job training.
29	(97 percent)	c.	for all distributive education students.
1	(3 percent)		No response

Analysis and Comments.—The majority views on the issue are strongly evident: a classroom with laboratory facilities such as a display unit, sales counter, and cash register is for all distributive education students.

Although Ken Ertel does not respond to the alternatives, he comments: "These may be a waste of time, especially with a cooperative program. It depends on the program objectives. Most of the labs I have seen are used weakly by inadequately trained teachers. Their use is for a very limited group of performance objectives."

On the contrary, Richard Ashmun argues: "The classroom lab gives an environment in which to practice and build self-confidence and helps to reduce fear barriers and tensions."

Many of the respondents affirm that *all* students should have the opportunity to benefit from this type of facility.

	Importance of this issue		
a.	Critical	5	(17 percent)
b.	Very important	12	(40 percent)
c.	Important	11	(36 percent)
d.	Little importance	2	(7 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

The respondents are divided in opinion about the importance of this issue, the dichotomy being between "very important" and "important."

27. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—The distributive education classroom for the project or laboratory method program should have a model store unit.

12	(40 percent)	a. Strongly agree
12	(40 percent)	b. Agree
6	(20 percent)	c. Uncertain
None		d. Disagree
None		e. Strongly disagree

Analysis and Comments.—A firm majority of the leaders are in accord that the distributive education classroom for the project method program should have a model store unit. The leaders who differ in opinion are uncertain about the necessity of a model store unit.

Expressing this uncertainty, Harland Samson states: "The facility must be appropriate for the learning activities to be carried out and the model store unit may not do it!"

Edwin Nelson comments: "Students who do not receive on-the-job training would use facilities as their extension of the instruction (place for application, testing, and try-out)."

Mary Marks indicates: "The 'model store unit' should be flexible so that appropriate occupational areas and/or specialities can be experienced."

	Importance of this issue		
a.	Critical	7	(23 percent)
b.	Very important	11	(37 percent)
c.	Important	6	(20 percent)
d.	Little importance	6	(20 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

The respondents hold varied opinions on the importance of this issue. The primary concensus is that this issue is "very important."

28. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—The distributive education classroom for the cooperative method should have a model store unit.

8	(27 percent)	a. Strongly agree
12	(40 percent)	b. Agree

6	(20 percent)	c.	Uncertain
4	(13 percent)	d.	Disagree
None		e.	Strongly disagree

Analysis and Comments.—A majority of the distributive education leaders concur that the distributive education classroom for the cooperative method should have a model store unit. Not as many leaders believe that it is necessary for the distributive education classroom to have a model store unit for the cooperative method of instruction as for the project method.

Reno Knouse concludes: "The best learning takes place when the proper atmosphere and facilities are available."

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	4	(14 percent)
b.	Very important	13	(43 percent)
c.	Important	7	(23 percent)
d.	Little importance	6	(20 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

The results on the importance of this issue are similar to those in No. 27. The primary contention on this issue's importance is "very important."

29. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—The approximate percentage of the distributive education classroom instructional time in the cooperative program that should be devoted by the student-trainee to the study of his specific job is:

None		a.	none.
2	(7 percent)	b.	less than one-fifth.
7	(23 percent)	c.	one-fifth to one-fourth.
8	(27 percent)	d.	one-fourth to one-third.
9	(30 percent)	e.	one-thrid to one-half.
2	(7 percent)	f.	one-half to three-fourths.
1	(3 percent)		No response
1	(3 percent)		More than one response

Analysis and Comments.—The responses are somewhat divided regarding the approximate percentage of classroom time in the cooperative program that should be devoted by the student-trainee to the study of his specific job. The largest portion of the respondents give answers ranging from one-fifth to one-half.

The individual not responding to the statement is opposed to any attempt to standardize the amount of time spent in individual instruction.

Lucy Crawford and Edwin Nelson concur that all instruction should be related to the student's job and his success in it. Crawford adds: "However, I think he should spend only a minimum amount of time in individual study."

Warren Meyer approaches the problem proportionally: "The percentage of time depends on the type of program. Less time for specialized

distributive education programs than for general programs because the common competencies are greater."

Mary Marks is of the opinion that "the student's specific job is the desirable arena for these specifics. The scope of his objectives should be the classroom emphasis." Agreeing with Marks, Edward Harris goes on to state: ". . . the range of time devoted to specific job instruction will vary with ability of students and the contribution of job instruction to his career goal."

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	5	(17 percent)
b.	Very important	11	(37 percent)
c.	Important	10	(33 percent)
d.	Little importance	4	(13 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

The principal division of opinion about the issue's importance is between "very important" and "important."

30. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—The responsibility for establishing the distributive education teacher certification standards should be left to:

None		a.	the certification department, State Department of Education.
None		b.	the distributive education teacher-education institutions (universities).
6	(20 percent)	c.	the Distributive Education Division, State Department of Education.
12	(40 percent)	d.	a combination of A & C above.
10	(33 percent)	e.	a combination of A & B above.
2	(7 percent)		No response

Analysis and Comments.—The respondents are widely divided in their delegation of the responsibility for establishing the distributive education teacher certification standards. Forty percent of the leaders indicate that the state certification department and the state distributive education department should share this responsibility, while one-third of the respondents prefer a combination of the state certification department and the state distributive education teacher-education institutions. In almost all combinations, it is suggested that there should be input from the state distributive education department as well as the teacher-training institutions.

Neal Vivian suggests that in an ideal situation the State Department of Distributive Education should set minimum standards for certification and that "the teacher-education institutions should develop programs within the framework of their own institutions that improve and expand upon these minimum standards."

Selecting another alternative, Edwin Nelson defends his choice: "The distributive education state staff would serve as advisors to the certification

staff. State plan provisions and other factors must be acceptable and consistent with decisions reached in the certification department."

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	7	(23 percent)
b.	Very important	13	(44 percent)
c.	Important	9	(30 percent)
d.	Little importance	1	(3 percent)
e.	No importance	None	

The leaders, in general, consider the issue as either "very important" or "important," with "very important" the most frequently checked response.

31. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—Teacher certification in distributive education should be dependent upon certification in some other major or minor teaching area.

None	a.	Strongly agree
4 (13 percent)	b.	Agree
2 (7 percent)	c.	Uncertain
8 (27 percent)	d.	Disagree
16 (53 percent)	e.	Strongly disagree

Analysis and Comments.—The majority of the leaders strongly disagree that teacher certification in distributive education should be dependent upon certification in some other major or minor teaching area.

Richard Ashmun and Neal Vivian stress that there should be distributive educators and not combinations, that distributive education should stand alone, and that certification should not be tied to some other teaching area. Peter Haines further comments: "The critical point is what does the teacher trainee have as *his* career goals and probable employment route."

On the other hand, however, Reno Knouse firmly upholds the minority opinion: "I think a good case can be made for dual certification in the basic business subjects that contribute to the business background of the distributive education teacher trainee."

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	6	(20 percent)
b.	Very important	15	(50 percent)
c.	Important	7	(23 percent)
d.	Little importance	2	(7 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

One-half of the leaders list this issue as "very important."

32. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—The relationship of the occupational experience for the laboratory or project teacher and the cooperative teacher should be:

2	(7 percent)	a.	the cooperative teacher needs more occupational experience than the project teacher.
3	(10 percent)	b.	the cooperative teacher needs less occupational experience than the project teacher.
25	(83 percent)	c.	the cooperative teacher needs the same occupational experience as the project teacher.

Analysis and Comments.—A substantial majority of the leaders are in accord that the teacher of a cooperative program needs the same occupational experience as the teacher of a project program.

According to Reno Knouse, "the idea is to have the best qualified teacher in the classroom, and my rationale for my response is that both teachers should have adequate occupational experience." T. Carl Brown takes a middle of the road approach, indicating that in practice the same occupational experience is required for both the cooperative and project teachers, but that it may be more realistic to require less occupational experience of the cooperative teacher.

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	4	(13 percent)
b.	Very important	17	(57 percent)
c.	Important	7	(23 percent)
d.	Little importance	2	(7 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

The majority of the respondents consider this issue "very important." The secondary choice is "important."

33. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.--The length of the extended contract for distributive education coordinators should be:

2	(7 percent)	a.	two weeks.
17	(56 percent)	b.	four weeks.
None		c.	six weeks.
9	(30 percent)	d.	eight weeks.
2	(7 percent)		No response

Analysis and Comments.—The leaders are divided in opinion on the length of the extended contract for distributive education coordinators. The trend indicated is for a four-week extended contract.

Supporting with a minority viewpoint, Neal Vivian comments: "We can no longer afford the luxury of nine- or ten-month programs. If programs are to be really effective in meeting the needs of our youth and adults, we must think in terms of year-round programs." Reno Knouse agrees, feeling that the cooperative program should be a continuous one. He said, "While we are making gains in extending it to eleven months, increased efforts should be made to extend it to twelve months."

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	6	(20 percent)
b.	Very important	14	(47 percent)
c.	Important	7	(23 percent)
d.	Little importance	1	(3 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)
	No response	2	(7 percent)

The most frequently marked response suggests that the issue is considered "very important," followed by "important" and "critical."

Section III: Teacher Education

Fifteen teacher education issues (Items 34 through 48 on the check-sheet) were analyzed.

34. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—Teacher education should provide students majoring in distributive education with instruction in planning, organizing, and promotion of adult programs.

27	(90 percent)	a.	yes
3	(10 percent)	b.	yes, but only for those students who indicate an interest in this area
None		c.	no

Analysis and Comments.—The leaders are in almost complete agreement that teacher education should provide students majoring in distributive education with instruction in planning, organizing, and promotion of adult programs.

Several express the need for all distributive education personnel to be involved in the total program, and further believe that the teacher-coordinator should either direct or teach in the adult program whenever possible. Neal Vivian confirms this. "If we are concerned with a total program approach," he replies, "all of our teachers should be prepared on the adult level."

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	11	(37 percent)
b.	Very important	9	(30 percent)
c.	Important	10	(33 percent)
d.	Little importance	0	(0 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

The respondents are once again almost evenly divided in opinion on the importance of this issue. Most have decided that this issue is "critical," followed closely by "important" and "very important."

35. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—The distributive education teacher education program should be located in:

14	(47 percent)	a.	the College of Education.
9	(30 percent)	b.	the College of Business.
7	(23 percent)	c.	other _____.

Analysis and Comments.—The leaders differ in opinion on where the distributive teacher education program should be located. Almost half prefer it to be located in the College of Education. Neal Vivian makes the following assertion: "This is a crucial question and I am firmly convinced that we, as an educational program, belong with our colleagues in education." Lucy Crawford agrees with Vivian and adds: "It is an educational program and should be associated with other programs with similar purposes."

Several respondents checked the alternative "other," and then commented "whatever is local practice." Some mention that "location is of minor importance; however, distributive education should have involvement in both education and business." One respondent checks "other" and lists "the College of Applied Technical Studies."

Finally, Peter Haines makes a summarizing statement: "This age old and decisive question is academic—the real question is what unit will be supportive of a total program of teaching, research, and service, and which will provide needed resources to achieve this program."

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	9	(30 percent)
b.	Very important	9	(30 percent)
c.	Important	9	(30 percent)
d.	Little importance	3	(10 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

Three alternatives receive equal votes on the importance of this issue: "critical," "very important," and "important."

36. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—For administration purposes, the distributive education department should be organized as:

4	(13 percent)	a.	a part of the Business Education Department.
21	(70 percent)	b.	a part of the Vocational Education Department, sharing equal status with other service areas.
4	(14 percent)	c.	a separate department.
1	(3 percent)		No response

Analysis and Comments.—The majority of the leaders tend to agree that, for administration purposes, the distributive education department should be organized as a part of the Vocational Education Department, sharing equal status with other service areas.

Agreeing with the majority, Warren Meyer adds: "We have achieved more in one year as a *department* within the division of Vocational-

Technical Education than we did in five years as a program in the department of secondary education."

Several of the leaders are not especially concerned about the organization as long as it "works." Reno Knouse states: "Since the people involved are more important than the type of organization, the program should be able to be operated effectively under different types of organization." Others indicate that "distributive education should be organized and administered on the same basis as any other discipline."

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	11	(37 percent)
b.	Very important	11	(37 percent)
c.	Important	3	(10 percent)
d.	Little importance	4	(13 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)
	No response	1	(3 percent)

The alternatives "critical" and "very important" receive an equal number of responses.

37. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—In the preparation of distributive education teacher-coordinators, emphasis should be placed on preparing them to work with:

None		a.	specific audiences such as central city youth.
3	(10 percent)	b.	general audiences.
27	(90 percent)	c.	both general and specific audiences on an equal basis.

Analysis and Comments.—A considerable majority of the leaders agree that in the preparation of teacher-coordinators, emphasis should be placed on preparing them to work with both general and specific audiences on an equal basis. T. Carl Brown emphasizes: "I don't like the term 'audiences'; that's what is wrong with most so-called education. We should substitute 'learners'."

In support of the secondary choice, Neal Vivian comments: "In the undergraduate program, restraints of time, etc., force us to focus our attention on preparing our teachers for general audiences."

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	5	(17 percent)
b.	Very important	18	(60 percent)
c.	Important	7	(23 percent)
d.	Little importance	0	(0 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

The primary belief is that this issue is "very important," followed by "important" and "critical."

38. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—The preparation of distributive education teacher-coordinators should be:

21	(70 percent)	a.	primarily an undergraduate program.
5	(17 percent)	b.	primarily a graduate program.
4	(13 percent)		No response

Analysis and Comments.—The distributive leaders tend to agree that the preparation of distributive education teacher-coordinators should be primarily an undergraduate program.

Almost all of the respondents, however, indicate both types of programs are necessary. Edward Harris synthesizes this opinion: "A good graduate program is built on a sound undergraduate program." Reno Knouse further indicates that more emphasis should be placed on the "complete teacher" at the graduate level rather than at the undergraduate level.

Leaning toward an emphasis on graduate study, Harland Samson believes that "essential pre-service preparation cannot be done in typical BA/BS sequences without elimination of desirable business or academic content."

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	10	(33 percent)
b.	Very important	12	(40 percent)
c.	Important	4	(13 percent)
d.	Little importance	2	(7 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)
	No response	2	(7 percent)

The alternative receiving the most responses is "very important," followed by "critical" and "important."

39. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—The certification requirements for teachers in distributive education should be:

20	(67 percent)	a.	specific for various teachers and teacher-coordinators, post-secondary teachers, and project program teachers.
9	(30 percent)	b.	a uniform set of requirements for all teachers.
1	(3 percent)		No response

Analysis and Comments.—A considerable majority of the distributive education leaders believe the certification requirements for teachers should be specific for various teachers and teacher-coordinators, post-secondary teachers, and project teachers.

Fairchild Carter indicates that a uniform set of requirements for all teachers, with some variation of emphasis if career objectives are really defined, would be desirable. Moreover, T. Carl Brown believes too specific certification requirements would be a disservice to teachers and unworkable.

Lucy Crawford and Warren Meyer are of the opinion that requirements for post-secondary teachers should be different than those for the secondary

teacher but not necessarily different for the project and cooperative teacher.

That optional patterns of certification are needed for serving different groups of people is pointed out by Neal Vivian. In accordance with this general mode of thought, Edward Harris indicates that the post-secondary personnel definitely need to have a higher level employment experience requirement.

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	7	(24 percent)
b.	Very important	12	(40 percent)
c.	Important	9	(30 percent)
d.	Little importance	1	(3 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)
	No response	1	(3 percent)

The primary response is that this issue is "very important," while the next most frequent choice is "important."

40. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—In the preparation of teachers, distributive teacher education departments should be responsible for:

16	(53 percent)	a.	teaching only the professional courses in distributive education.
13	(44 percent)	b.	teaching both the professional courses and the technical content courses.
1	(3 percent)		No response

Analysis and Comments.—Most educators agree that the distributive teacher education departments should be responsible for teaching only the professional courses in distributive education.

While not responding to this statement, Fairchild Carter indicates that so much "depends on organization, department placement, and teacher education credentials."

Lucy Crawford, Mary Klaurens, Reno Knouse, and Edward Harris express a concern that appropriate technical courses are not available. One notes that "many modern schools of business are now specializing in top management training, and their courses are no longer adequate for teacher preparation." Edward Harris states: "If collegiate schools of business continue to force unrealistic standards, it may become necessary to offer relevant technical courses."

Vivian Ely, Richard Ashmun, and others concur that "the technical content courses should be taught by specialists in the marketing area." Ashmun prefaces his remarks with this conditions: "provided sound instruction can be obtained in other departments such as marketing."

Edwin Nelson concludes: "The importance of this issue lies in the fact that appropriate technical courses are available. Where they are offered shouldn't make a great deal of difference."

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	6	(20 percent)
b.	Very important	11	(37 percent)
c.	Important	8	(27 percent)
d.	Little importance	4	(13 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)
	No response	1	(3 percent)

The distributive education leaders are divided in their opinion about the importance of this issue. Most hold this issue to be "very important." Less frequent choices are "important" and "critical."

41. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—Substantial in-depth occupational experience may be substituted for some of the technical content courses in the teacher preparation program.

6	(20 percent)	a.	Strongly agree
20	(66 percent)	b.	Agree
2	(7 percent)	c.	Uncertain
2	(7 percent)	d.	Disagree
None		e.	Strongly disagree

Analysis and Comments.—Most of the leaders in distributive education agree that substantial in-depth occupational experience may be substituted for some of the technical content courses in the teacher preparation program.

Lucy Crawford qualifies her response by adding: "if some way of evaluating the recency and quality of the occupational experience can be determined." Mary Marks also agrees, providing equivalency is determined by "examination and not by opinion."

Peter Haines vehemently expresses his agreement, considering the issue to be ". . . especially critical in view of the reluctance of many business administration units to offer what they deem 'vocational' courses."

On the other hand, Bernard Nye disagrees: "There is a need for technical courses as well as occupational experience."

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	2	(7 percent)
b.	Very important	14	(47 percent)
c.	Important	12	(40 percent)
d.	Little importance	2	(6 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

The primary response of the polled educators is that this issue is "very important," followed by "important" and "critical."

42. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—Teacher education requirements should be modified to permit non-degree teachers with substantial

in-depth occupational experience to teach in the secondary programs as a step toward differential staffing.

9	(30 percent)	a.	Strongly agree
12	(40 percent)	b.	Agree
3	(10 percent)	c.	Uncertain
5	(17 percent)	d.	Disagree
None		e.	Strongly disagree
1	(3 percent)		No response

Analysis and Comments.—A substantial majority of the leaders agree that teacher education requirements should be modified to permit non-degree teachers with substantial in-depth occupational experience to teach in the secondary programs. Reno Knouse comments:

> The idea is to have the best qualified teacher in the classroom. However, we are so degree conscious that it may take some time to overcome this problem. Possibly these persons could be used to teach in the newer and emerging fields of distribution until such time that traditional attitudes can be changed.

Lucy Crawford expresses uncertainty, but adds: "I would agree if the duties of the non-degree teacher were identified and if appropriate professional courses were required to qualify the teacher to perform these duties." Bernard Nye's agreement is also conditional—"only if the teacher is teaching a specific course within a total program."

Ken Ertel feels that "this issue is especially important in light of emerging concepts about career education."

Warren Meyer makes this suggestion: "New para-professional positions should be created with certification requirements and special types of teaching positions, but the requirements for present positions should not be modified."

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	5	(17 percent)
b.	Very important	11	(36 percent)
c.	Important	10	(33 percent)
d.	Little importance	2	(7 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)
	No response	2	(7 percent)

The most frequently chosen alternative is that the issue is "very important," followed closely by "important."

43. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—The responsibility for identifying the in-service training needs for distributive education teachers belongs primarily to the:

15	(50 percent)	a.	distributive education state supervisory personnel of the State Department of Education.

7	(23 percent)	b.	distributive education teacher educators located at teacher training institutions.
6	(20 percent)	c.	local supervisors of vocational education.
2	(7 percent)		More than one response

Analysis and Comments.—The majority of the leaders indicate that the responsibility for identifying the in-service training needs of teachers belongs to the distributive education state supervisory personnel of the State Department of Education. Several of the respondents indicate that the ideal situation would be involvement of all three groups.

Todd Sagraves is enthusiastic in this regard: "A combination of the choices would be ideal! Under normal circumstances, the teacher educator who supervises student teachers will know more about the needs than the average supervisor."

Mary Marks believes that this responsibility belongs to "local supervisors in cooperation with state supervisory personnel."

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	7	(24 percent)
b.	Very important	12	(40 percent)
c.	Important	9	(30 percent)
d.	Little importance	1	(3 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)
	No response	1	(3 percent)

Most respondents list this issued as "very important." The second most frequent choice is "important."

44. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—The responsibility for carrying out the in-service training of distributive education teachers belongs to the:

11	(37 percent)	a.	distributive education state supervisory personnel of the State Department of Education.
15	(50 percent)	b	distributive education teacher educators located at teacher training institutions.
1	(3 percent)	c.	local supervisors of vocational education.
1	(3 percent)		No response
2	(7 percent)		More than one response

Analysis and Comments.—The leaders tend toward agreement that the responsibility for carrying out the in-service training of teachers belongs to the distributive education teacher educators. As in the previous issue, many of the respondents indicate that there should be a shared responsibility in this area.

Lucy Crawford notes that "the teacher educator should provide in-service training at the request of state supervisory personnel." However, Neal

Vivian feels that the "ultimate responsibility rests with the state supervisor, but he may delegate the task to a teacher educator."

Importance of this issue			
a.	Critical	4	(14 percent)
b.	Very important	15	(50 percent)
c.	Important	9	(30 percent)
d.	Little importance	1	(3 percent)
e.	No importance	1	(3 percent)

The majority of the respondents agree that this issue is "very important," followed by "important."

45. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—Distributive education student teachers should have student teaching experience which provides them with the opportunity to:

1	(3 percent)	a.	observe adult courses.
None		b.	assist in teaching adult courses.
4	(14 percent)	c.	observe planning and organization of adult courses.
None		d.	assist in planning and organization of adult courses.
25	(83 percent)	e.	the following combination of the above _____. *(Please state)*

Analysis and Comments.—The majority of the leaders select a combination of the offered alternatives concerning the distributive education student teachers' experience in adult education. Eleven of the leaders select all of the alternatives. Five of the leaders feel that this experience should include assisting in teaching, planning, and organization ("b" and "d"). Four feel that observation and assisting in planning and organization are necessary ("a" and "d"), and two respondents feel that student teaching should be limited to observing ("a" and "c").

Warren Meyer selects all the alternatives, and defends his reaction thusly: "This component of distributive education must be strengthened or the total distributive education program will degenerate."

Importance of this issue			
a.	Critical	3	(10 percent)
b.	Very important	16	(53 percent)
c.	Important	7	(23 percent)
d.	Little importance	4	(14 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

Most of the respondents deem this issue to be "very important," followed by the choices of "important" and "critical."

46. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—A state supported college or university should be expected to provide a distributive teacher education program without additional financial support from the State Department of Education.

7	(23 percent)	a.	Strongly agree
7	(23 percent)	b.	Agree
2	(7 percent)	c.	Uncertain
11	(37 percent)	d.	Disagree
3	(10 percent)	e.	Strongly disagree

Analysis and Comments.—The leaders are almost equally divided as to whether a state supported college or university should be expected to provide a distributive teacher education program without additional financial support from the State Department of Education.

Harry Applegate indicates he is undecided, but adds, "the state supervisor needs the 'in' that financial support provides."

In disagreement, Lucy Crawford replies: "Ancillary funds are provided to make vocational teacher education 'something special.' I believe that special funding is needed in order to carry out the responsibility identified by the U.S.O.E."

Richard Ashmun concludes his remarks by saying that "the trend seems to be in this direction, but we do want to maintain our uniqueness and close working relationship with the state department." Mary Marks comments: "There are conditions and cost factors for occupational teacher education which are over or different from the usual costs. The state has a legal responsibility in this area."

Neal Vivian, however, firmly asserts the opposite viewpoint: "I believe it is no longer necessary or desirable to give special support to teacher education in vocational areas. Colleges and universities should recognize their obligations to provide teachers for these areas just as they have for the traditional academic areas."

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	14	(47 percent)
b.	Very important	8	(27 percent)
c.	Important	7	(23 percent)
d.	Little importance	1	(3 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

Almost half of the respondents consider this issue to be "critical," followed by the less frequent selections, "very important," and "important."

47. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT—The development of competencies necessary for a DECA chapter advisor should be included as part of the teacher education program.

19	(63 percent)	a.	Strongly agree
11	(37 percent)	b.	Agree
None		c.	Uncertain
None		d.	Disagree
None		e.	Strongly disagree

Analysis and Comments.—All of the respondents either agree or strongly agree that the development of competencies necessary for a DECA chapter advisor should be included as a part of the teacher education program.

Todd Sagraves expresses the need for a "special course which explains the organization and administration of vocational education youth organizations—especially DECA!"

And Reno Knouse supports this opinion, stating:

> I feel strongly that all teacher education students should be active participants in local, area, and state DECA activities. Teacher educators should 'practice what they preach' by providing the opportunity for participation.

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	14	(47 percent)
b.	Very important	8	(27 percent)
c.	Important	7	(23 percent)
d.	Little importance	1	(3 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

The response to the importance of this issue is exactly as the preceding issue with almost 50 percent of the leaders indicating it to be "critical."

48. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—The development of competencies necessary for a DECA chapter advisor should be included at teacher training institutions:

18	(60 percent)	a.	in existing courses being offered.
12	(40 percent)	b.	in a separate course for this specific purpose.

Analysis and Comments.—The majority of the leaders think the development of competencies necessary for a DECA chapter advisor should be included in existing courses being offered at the teacher training institutions.

Harry Applegate comments: "If DECA is to be recognized as a 'part of' distributive education, it must have specific identity as such."

Mary Klaurens believes that there should be a collegiate DECA chapter "to give students a direct experience in DECA activities, in addition to a course." Edward Harris agrees with Klaurens that "probably the best way for students to learn is to give students experience through their own distributive education club."

Eugene Dorr indicates that "DECA should be taught to potential teachers as a part of distributive education." Several other leaders agree with Dorr that, due to the crowded curriculum, it is difficult to set up a great number of additional courses.

	Importance of this issue		
a.	Critical	7	(23 percent)
b.	Very important	12	(40 percent)
c.	Important	8	(27 percent)
d.	Little importance	2	(7 percent)
e.	No importance	1	(3 percent)

The respondents are divided in their opinion on the importance of this issue. However, 63 percent of the respondents feel that the issue is at least "very important."

Section IV: Curriculum and Related Issues

Four issues on curriculum and related issues (Items 49 through 52) are analyzed.

49. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—Distributive education students in the cooperative program:

None		•a.	have little need for textbook and reference materials.
None		b.	should use one basic textbook with little or no reference to supplemental books and materials.
14	(47 percent)	c.	should use one basic textbook but should refer frequently to supplemental reference books and materials.
16	(53 percent)	d.	should use a series of reference materials with no one source designated as the basic textbook.

Analysis and Comments.—The majority of the leaders believe that distributive education students in the cooperative program should use a series of reference materials with no one source designated as the basic textbook. This selection is followed closely by the belief that one basic textbook should be used with frequent reference to supplemental reference books and materials.

Mary Marks affirms the opinion of the majority, stating: "A variety of materials is more representative of employment condition and judgmental requirements."

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	3	(10 percent)
b.	Very important	14	(47 percent)
c.	Important	11	(36 percent)
d.	Little importance	2	(7 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

Most leaders feel that this issue is "very important." This alternative is followed closely by "important."

50. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—An occupational or career objective in distribution should be required of all distributive education students.

13	(44 percent)	a.	Strongly agree
14	(47 percent)	b.	Agree
1	(3 percent)	c.	Uncertain
1	(3 percent)	d.	Disagree
1	(3 percent)	e.	Strongly disagree

Analysis and Comments.—Almost all of the leaders agree that an occupational objective in distribution should be required of all distributive education students.

In support of the majority opinion, Warren Meyer insists that "there is no point to educating a person for a career in which he has no interest. When this is done it downgrades the program for students with career goals in distribution." Richard Ashmun also agrees, "even if only tentative at a particular point in time and subject to change based on trial, more information, and a better understanding of self." T. Carl Brown adds: "I would prefer 'career interest' rather than career objective because students lack counseling and experience for definite objectives." Harland Samson goes on to say that "distributive education should offer courses for other students, however."

In expressing his disagreement, Harry Applegate offers the following criticism: "This requirement tends to 'turn away' student enrollment." Moreover, Ron Strand comments: "It is very difficult for beginning students to have an objective in a field he knows little or nothing about."

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	8	(27 percent)
b.	Very important	12	(40 percent)
c.	Important	10	(33 percent)
d.	Little importance	0	(0 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

The respondents consider this issue "very important," followed by 'important" and "critical."

51. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—Student placement in a distributive occupation or job, upon completion of the distributive

education program, is valid criteria for evaluation of a distributive education program.

6	(20 percent)	a.	Strongly agree
16	(53 percent)	b.	Agree
4	(13 percent)	c.	Uncertain
2	(7 percent)	d.	Disagree
2	(7 percent)	e.	Strongly disagree

Analysis and Comments.—The leaders hold to the position that student placement in a distributive occupation, upon completion of the distributive education program, is a valid criterion for evaluation of a distributive education program.

Several of the leaders comment that placement in a distributive occupation is one criterion, but not the only criterion, for a program evaluation. For example, Warren Meyer states that "placement in a distributive occupation is one criterion among several and it is valid but should not be the sole measure." Mary Klaurens is of similar opinion: "It is a criterion, but not the only one. Satisfactory performance and job satisfaction are more important."

Lucy Crawford states: "If a student has learned good work habits and is able to transfer his learning to another job, whether distribution or not, the distributive education program has made a valuable contribution to the student's development." Mary Marks comments lie in the same vein: "Placement is evidence, but impact on the student is equally important. We must remember that we cannot control employment nor a student's freedom of choice; and we shouldn't. And Peter Haines notes: "What is critical is an assessment of what the student achieved as a human being. I realize that this is difficult to measure and that placement data are 'political sugar'."

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	6	(20 percent)
b.	Very important	12	(40 percent)
c.	Important	10	(33 percent)
d.	Little importance	0	(0 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)
	No response	2	(7 percent)

The respondents tend to agree that this issue is either "very important" or "important."

52. CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT.—The teaching contract which exists between the teacher-coordinator and the local school system should:

11	(37 percent)	a.	specify responsibility in the area of adult distributive education.
1	(3 percent)	b.	*not* specify responsibility in the area of adult distributive education.

8	(27 percent)	c.	*not* specify responsibility in the area of adult distributive education, because this responsibility is assumed to be an integral part of the job.
10	(33 percent)	d.	Other: (Please specify) _____.

Analysis and comments.—The largest percentage of leaders indicate that the teaching contract which exists between the teacher-coordinator and the local school system should specify responsibility in the area of adult distributive education. Several of the leaders, however, specify other alternatives.

Lucy Crawford states:

> Specifying the responsibility for adult distributive education is an advantage to the teacher-coordinator because it assures that time will be provided. This responsibility should be a factor in obtaining an extended contract because of the *planning time* needed in the summer.

Edward Ferguson indicates that the responsibility for adult education "should be negotiated by the teacher and the school district."

Mary Klaurens goes further to state that the contract between the coordinator and the local school should:

> Specify what the teacher-coordinator's responsibility is in view of current practices, unless the contract is based on a written local plan, which specifies the teacher-coordinator's duties and responsibilities with regard to adult education.

Mildred Jackson notes that this adult education responsibility should be "identified in keeping with the state's policy." And, according to Neal Vivian, "all teacher-coordinators should have some responsibility for adult education and this should be clearly specified in the contractual relationship."

Importance of this issue

a.	Critical	7	(23 percent)
b.	Very important	10	(34 percent)
c.	Important	7	(23 percent)
d.	Little importance	6	(20 percent)
e.	No importance	0	(0 percent)

The respondents have different opinions about the importance of this issue. More of the leaders list "very important" than any other choice, followed by "critical" and "important."

Summary of Findings

The next step is to organize and summarize the issue statements according to (1) content homogeneity and (2) the degree of agreement among the respondents.

Content homogeneity

The check sheet is organized into sections involving (1) philosophy, (2) organization and administration, (3) teacher education, and (4) curriculum and related issues. The issue statements are summarized according to a different organization so that certain conclusions can be drawn from the findings.

A reader might, however, be interested in following the content homogeneity of the check sheet classification when reading the summary of the findings. To make this procedure possible without having to read all of the issue statements, the listing of the issues is coded. A number one (1), two (2), three (3), or four (4) is listed in parentheses after each issue statement. The number represents the following topical classifications:

(1) philosophy
(2) organization and administration
(3) teacher education
(4) curriculum and related issues

Following the number of topical classifications, the choice index rating, which indicates the importance of the statement based on a scale of one to five with five representing most importance, is given for each statement.

Degree of agreement among the respondents

Within the four categories identified above, the issue statements are further identified according to the degree of agreement among the respondents. The issue statements are groups as follows:

A. Those issue statements on which there is almost complete agreement (90 percent or more), indicating that the statements might be considered as principles.

B. Those issue statements on which a great majority agree (67 to 89 percent). These statements might be considered as premises.

C. Those issue statements on which the respondents are divided in opinion, but indicating a tendency (50 to 60 percent) in favor of one alternative.

D. Those issue statements on which there is complete lack of agreement (no alternative receiving 50 percent or more), indicating no apparent trend of thought.

Group A.—Almost all (90 percent or more) of the distributive educators who respond to the issue statement are in agreement on each of the following eight statements, indicating that the statements might be considered as principles.

	Category	Choice Index
1. Distributive education should be offered on both the secondary and post-secondary levels.	(1)	4.600
2. The DECA program of youth activities should be viewed as a cocurricular activity.	(1)	4.300

	Category	Choice Index
3. Adult distributive education should be offered when and where needs can be identified and appropriate program developed.	(1)	4.100
4. Coordination in school systems with more than one cooperative distributive education program should be done by the person who teaches the student.	(2)	4.433
5. Assuming that on-the-job experience is required, the experience must be coordinated by a teacher-coordinator or coordinator.	(2)	4.833
6. A classroom with laboratory facilities such as a display unit, sales counter, cash register, etc. is for both cooperative and project method distributive education students.	(2)	3.667
7. Teacher education should provide students majoring in distributive education with instruction in planning, organizing, and promotion of adult education.	(3)	3.967
8. In the preparation of distributive education teacher-coordinators, emphasis should be placed on preparing them to work with both general and specific audiences on an equal basis.	(3)	4.000

Group B.—A considerable majority (67 to 89 percent) of the distributive educators who respond to the issue statement tend toward agreement on the following eleven statements, indicating that the statements might be considered as premises.

	Category	Choice Index
1. The state distributive education department and the local distributive education personnel should be responsible for adult distributive education.	(1)	4.133
2. The post-secondary program in distributive education should primarily offer specialized programs in specific areas of marketing and distribution.	(1)	3.933
3. Students given the least priority for enrollment in distributive education should be youth whose career goals require a four-year college degree.	(1)	3.700
4. Distributive education students should be paid for their on-the-job training on the basis of the same salary as paid to any part-time employee.	(1)	3.633
5. The primary responsibility of distributive education at the secondary level should be to prepare most students for entry level positions in general areas as well as preparing for specialized areas when facilities are adequate.	(1)	3.867
6. A written training plan is always necessary to insure optimum training.	(1)	4.400

	Category	Choice Index
7. The relationship of the occupational experience for the laboratory or project teacher and the cooperative teacher should be that they both need the same occupational experience.	(2)	3.800
8. The preparation of distributive education teacher-coordinators should be primarily an undergraduate program.	(3)	4.133
9. The certification requirements for teachers in distributive education should be specific for various teachers and teacher-coordinators, post-secondary teachers, and project program teachers.	(3)	3.933
10. Distributive education student teachers should have student teaching experience which provides them with the opportunity to assist and observe the planning, organization, and teaching of adult courses.	(3)	3.567
11. For administration purposes, the distributive education department should be organized as a part of the Vocational Education Department, sharing equal status with other service areas.	(3)	4.033

Group C.—The distributive educators are divided in opinion on the following issues. There is, however, a tendency (from 50 to 66 percent) in favor of one opinion. The most favored opinion is the first one listed and is italicized. The opinions which follow the majority opinion are listed in their rank order of preference. Opinons selected by 10 percent or fewer of the respondents are omitted. The 20 issues in this division are:

	Category	Choice Index
1. Specialized programs in distributive education should be offered primarily on *both the secondary and post-secondary level* rather than just the post-secondary level.	(1)	3.867
2. Students given the highest priority for enrollment in distributive education should be *the readily employable youth who desire immediate employment after high school graduation.*	(1)	4.333
3. The primary responsibility of distributive education at the post-secondary or technical level should be *to prepare students for mid-management positions in general areas of marketing and distribution*, rather than preparing students for specialization in certain areas of marketing and distribution.	(1)	3.767
4. The competitive activities in the high school division of DECA should be *open to all members of DECA, with cooperative students competing with non-cooperative students*, rather than competition being	(1)	3.933

	Category	Choice Index
limited to cooperative students competing with cooperative students and non-cooperative students competing with non-cooperative students.		
5. The need for career education and exploration programs at the K-10 level can best be met by *vocational education* rather than general education.	(1)	4.467
6. A written training plan should be required and signed by every distributive education cooperative student (*strongly agree*, agree).	(1)	4.300
7. A training agreement should be required for every distributive education student and signed by the coordinator, employer, and student (*strongly agree*, agree).	(1)	3.967
8. Distributive education teacher-coordinators should be required to renew their occupational experience every (*3-5 years*, 5-7 years, 7-10 years).	(1)	3.667
9. The student placement activities of the distributive education teacher-coordinator should include *jobs in distribution for only those students enrolled in the distributive education cooperative program*, rather than jobs in distribution for the total school placement programs.	(2)	3.906
10. In an ideal situation, the teacher-coordinator should visit the student-trainee on the job at least *once every two weeks*, rather than once a month.	(2)	3.933
11. Teacher certification in distributive education should be dependent upon certification in some other major or minor teaching area (*strongly disagree*, disagree, agree).	(3)	3.800
12. The length of the extended contract for distributive education coordinators should be *four weeks* rather than eight weeks.	(3)	4.000
13. In the preparation of teachers, distributive education departments should be responsible for *teaching only the professional courses in distributive education*, rather than teaching both the professional and the technical content courses.	(3)	3.733
14. Substantial in-depth occupational experience may be substituted for some of the technical content courses in the teacher preparation program (*agree*, strongly agree).	(3)	3.533
15. The responsibility for identifying the in-service training needs of distributive education teachers belongs primarily to the: (a) *distributive education state supervisory personnel of the State Department of Education*, (b) distributive education teachers educators located at teacher training institutions, (c) local supervisors of vocational education.	(3)	3.900

	Category	Choice Index
16. The responsibility for carrying out the in-service training of distributive education teachers belongs to the *distributive education teacher educators located at the teacher training institutions*, rather than distributive education state supervisory personnel of the State Department of Education.	(3)	3.667
17. The development of competencies necessary for a DECA chapter advisor should be included as a part of the teacher education program (*strongly agree*, agree).	(3)	4.133
18. The development of competencies for a DECA chapter advisor should be included at teacher training institutions *in existing courses being offered*, rather than in a separate course for this specific purpose.	(3)	3.767
19. Distributive education students in the cooperative program should use *a series of reference materials with no one source designated as the basic textbook*, rather than one basic textbook with frequent reference to reference books and materials.	(4)	3.733
20. Student placement in a distributive occupation, upon completion of the distributive education program, is valid criteria for evaluation of a distributive education program (*agree*, strongly agree, uncertain).	(4)	4.033

Group D.—There is a lack of agreement on the following issues and no one alternative received the support of the majority. The alternatives are, however, listed in their rank order of support. Alternatives selected by 10 percent or fewer of the respondents are omitted. The 13 issues in this division are:

	Category	Choice Index
*1. The present activities of DECA are effectively accomplishing the stated goals of the organization (agree, uncertain, strongly agree).	(1)	3.833
2. Local programs of distributive education should be financed by: (a) incentive reimbursement—based upon the degree to which desirable program standards are met; (b) reimbursement for only those activities that are not typically financed by local school districts such as: travel allowances, extended service contracts, etc.	(1)	4.167
3. Classroom instruction, with simulated in-school laboratory job experiences, is adequate preparation for a secondary school student who plans a career in a distributive occupation (seldom, usually, no response).	(2)	4.133

	Category	Choice Index
4. *Final* selection of students for the distributive education program should be made by: (a) the coordinator exclusively; (b) the coordinator after the students have been recommended by the guidance department; (c) a committee composed of vocational teachers, guidance, and administrative personnel.	(2)	4.000
*5. The distributive education classroom for the project or laboratory method program should have a model store unit (agree, strongly agree, uncertain).	(2)	3.667
*6. The distributive education classroom for the cooperative method should have a model store unit (agree, strongly agree, uncertain, disagree).	(2)	3.400
7. The approximate percentage of the distributive education classroom instructional time in the cooperative program that should be devoted by the student-trainee to the study of his specific job is: (a) one-third to one-half, (b) one-fourth to one-third, (c) one-fifth to one-fourth.	(2)	3.600
8. The responsibility for establishing the distributive education teacher certification standards should be left to: (a) a combination of the certification depatment and the distributive education division of the State Department of Education; (b) a combination of the certification department, State Department of Education, and the distributive education teacher education institutions; and (c) the distributive education division, State Department of Education.	(3)	3.867
9. The distributive education teacher education program should be located in: (a) the College of Education; (b) the College of Business; and (c) other responses, including whatever is local practice.	(3)	3.733
*10. Teacher education requirements should be modified to permit non-degree teachers with substantial in-depth occupational experience to teach in the secondary programs as a step toward differential staffing (agree, strongly agree, disagree, uncertain).	(3)	3.867
11. A state supported college or university should be expected to provide a distributive teacher education program without additional financial support from the State Department of Education (disagree, agree, strongly agree, strongly disagree).	(3)	4.233
*12. An occupational or career objective in distributive education should be required of all distributive education students (agree, strongly agree).	(4)	3.833
13. The teaching contract which exists between the teacher-coordinator and the local school system should: (a) specify responsibility in the area of adult	(4)	3.600

	Category	Choice Index
education; (b) other: depends on coordinator, community size and need; (c) not specify responsibility in the area of adult distributive education, because this responsibility is assumed to be an integral part of the job.	(4)	3,600

*The differences in opinion on these issues exist between the alternative "strongly agree" and "agree." The majority of the respondents were in agreement; however, the dichotomy arises from the degree of agreement.

Importance of issues

The importance of the issues is depicted in the tables which follow. The first table indicates the statement number and the choice index of each. The second table gives the rank order of importance of each issue statement.

To determine the rank order of the issues' importance in determining effective operating procedures in distributive education, the method used by Brown (4) in his study of faculty mobility patterns was used. The following rating scale is used.

Score	Opinions of Leaders About Issues' Importance
5	(a) Critical
4	(b) Very important
3	(c) Important
2	(d) Little importance
1	(e) No importance

For each issue statement a number referred to as the Choice Index (CI), defined as follows, is calculated.

$$CI = \frac{(5 \times a) + (4 \times b) + (3 \times c) + (2 \times d) + (1 \times e)}{\text{total number of respondents}}$$

Depending upon the responses of the leaders, the Choice Index of a particular issue statement is bounded within the range one to five: one, if the respondent feels that the statement is of no importance; and five, if the respondent feels that the statement is critical in determining effective operating procedures in distributive education.

TABLE 1

CHOICE INDEX RATINGS ON THE IMPORTANCE OF ISSUE STATEMENTS

Item	Choice Index	Item	Choice Index
1	4.133	27	3.667
2	4.600	28	3.400
3	3.933	29	3.600
4	3.867	30	3.867
5	4.333	31	3.800
6	3.700	32	3.800
7	3.633	33	4.000
8	3.867	34	3.967
9	3.767	35	3.733
10	4.300	36	4.033
11	3.933	37	4.000
12	4.467	38	4.133
13	3.833	39	3.933
14	4.400	40	3.733
15	4.300	41	3.533
16	3.967	42	3.867
17	3.667	43	3.900
18	4.100	44	3.667
19	4.167	45	3.567
20	3.906	46	4.233
21	4.133	47	4.133
22	4.433	48	3.767
23	3.933	49	3.733
24	4.000	50	3.833
25	4.833	51	4.033
26	3.667	52	3.600

TABLE 2

RANK ORDER OF IMPORTANCE OF ISSUE STATEMENTS BY CHOICE INDEX

Rank	Issue No.	Issue Statement
1	25	Assuming that on-the-job experience is required, the experience (need not, must be) coordinated by a teacher-coordinator or coordinator.
2	2	Distributive education should be offered primarily on (secondary, post-secondary, both) level(s).
3	12	The need for career orientation and exploration programs at the K-10 level can best be met by (vocational, general) education.

Table 2 — Continued

Rank	Issue No.	Issue Statement
4	22	Coordination in school systems with more than one cooperative distributive education program should be done by (a person from a central office, the person who teaches the student).
5	14	A written training plan is necessary to insure optimum training.
6	5	What students should be given the highest priority for enrollment in distributive education?
7.5	15	Should a written training plan be required and signed by every distributive education cooperative student?
7.5	10	The DECA program of youth activities should be viewed as (extracurricular, cocurricular, completely disregarded).
9	46	Should a state supported college or university be expected to provide a distributive education teacher education program without additional financial support from the State Department of Education?
10	19	How should local programs of distributive education be financed?
12.5	1	What agency(ies) should be responsible for adult distributive education?
12.5	21	Is classroom instruction, with simulated in-school laboratory job experience, adequate preparation for a secondary school student who plans a career in a distributive occupation?
12.5	38	The preparation of distributive education teacher-coordinators should be primarily a(an) (undergraduate, graduate) program.
12.5	47	Should the development of competencies necessary for a DECA chapter advisor be included as a part of the teacher education program?
15	18	When should adult distributive education be provided?
16.5	36	For administration purposes, where should the distributive education department be organized?
16.5	51	Is student placement in a distributive occupation or job, upon completion of the distributive education program, valid criteria for evaluation of a distributive education program?
19	24	Who should make *final* selection of students for the distributive education program?

TABLE 2 – Continued

Rank	Issue No.	Issue Statement
19	33	What should be the length of extended contracts for distributive education coordinators?
19	37	In preparation of distributive education teacher-coordinators, emphasis should be placed on preparing them to work with (specific, general, both) audiences.
22.5	16	Should a training agreement be required for every distributive education student and signed by the coordinator, employer, and student?
22.5	34	Should teacher education provide students majoring in distributive education with instruction in planning, organizing and promotion of adult programs?
24.5	3	The post-secondary program in distributive education should primarily offer (general, specialized) programs in marketing and distribution.
24.5	11	To whom are the competitive activities in the high school division of DECA open?
24.5	23	In an ideal situation, how often should the teacher-coordinator visit the student trainee on the job?
24.5	39	The certification requirements for teachers in distributive education should be (specific for varoius teachers, uniform for all teachers).
27.5	20	What should the student placement activities of the distributive education teacher-coordinator include?
27.5	43	To whom does the primary responsibility for identifying the in-service training needs of distributive education teachers belong?
30.5	4	Specialized programs in distributive education should be offered primarily on (the) (secondary, post-secondary, both) level(s).
30.5	8	What is the primary responsibility of distributive education at the secondary level?
30.5	30	Who has the responsibility for establishing the distributive education teacher certification standards?
30.5	42	Should teacher education requirements be modified to permit non-degree teachers with substantial in-depth occupational experience to teach in the secondary programs?
33.5	13	Are the present activities of DECA effectively accomplishing the stated goals of the organization?
33.5	50	Should an occupational or career objective in distribution be required of all distributive education students?

TABLE 2 — Continued

Rank	Issue No.	Issue Statement
35.5	31	Should teacher certification in distributive education be dependent upon certification in some other major or minor teaching area?
35.5	32	What should be the relationship of the occupational experience for the laboratory or project teacher and the cooperative teacher?
37.5	9	What is the primary responsibility of distributive education at the post-secondary or techincal level?
37.5	48	The development of competencies necessary for a DECA chapter advisor should be included at the teacher training institutions in (a) (existing, separate) course(s).
40	35	Where should the distributive education teacher education program be located within the institution?
40	40	In the preparation of teachers, distributive teacher education departments should be responsible for teaching (only professional courses, both professional and technical content courses).
40	49	The distributive education students' use of textbooks and reference materials in the distributive education classroom.
42	6	Which students should be given the least priority for enrollment in distributive education?
44.5	17	How often should distributive education teacher-coordinators be required to renew (or supplement) their occupational experience?
44.5	26	A classroom with laboratory facilities such as a display unit, sales counter, cash register, etc. is for (cooperative, project, all) distributive education students.
44.5	27	Should the distributive education classroom for the project or laboratory method program have a model store unit?
44.5	44	To whom does the responsibility for carrying out the in-service training of distributive eduction teachers belong?
47	7	On what basis should the distributive education students be paid for their on-the-job training?
48.5	29	How much of the distributive education classroom instructional time in the cooperative program should be devoted to the study of his specific job?
48.5	52	Should the teaching contract which exists between the teacher-coordinator and the local school system specify

TABLE 2 – Concluded

Rank	Issue No.	Issue Statement
		responsibility in the area of adult distributive education?
50	45	Should distributive education student teachers have student teaching experience which provides them with an opportunity to observe and assist in teaching and planning adult courses?
51	41	May substantial in-depth occupational experience be substituted for some of the technical content courses in the teacher preparation program?
52	28	Should the distributive education classroom for the cooperative method have a model store unit?

CHAPTER IV

COMPARISON OF ISSUES WITH PREVIOUS STUDY

This chapter is devoted to comparing the issues of this study with the same issues studied by Warmke in 1960. The issue statements to be compared are presented in tables with the number and percentage of respondents who select each alternative listed for both Warmke's study and the present study.

TABLE 3

CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT—DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION TEACHER-COORDINATORS SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO RENEW (OR SUPPLEMENT) THEIR OCCUPATIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Alternatives		1960		1971	
		No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
a.	Never	4	8	2	7
b.	every year	0	0	1	3
c.	every 3-5 years	30	59	14	47
d.	every 5-7 years	10	20	6	20
e.	every 7-10 years	0	0	3	10
f.	other	6	12	0	0
	No opinion	1	2	3	10
	More than one response	0	0	1	3

Though the percentages vary among the alternatives, the trend of thought has not changed on the two alternatives receiving the most support. Both groups indicate as their first choice alternative "c" and their second choice alternative "d."

TABLE 4

CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT—THE STUDENT PLACEMENT ACTIVITIES OF THE DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION TEACHER-COORDINATOR SHOULD INCLUDE:

Alternatives		1960		1971	
		No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
a.	jobs in distribution for only those students enrolled in the distributive education cooperative program	16	31	16	53

TABLE 4 — Continued

Alternatives	1960		1971	
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
b. jobs in distribution for the total school placement program	20	39	14	47
c. the total school placement program regardless of the placement area	10	20	0	0
d. other	3	6	0	0
e. no opinion	2	4	0	0

The leaders responses in 1971 represent some change from 1960. In 1960, the alternative that the placement activities of the distributive education teacher-coordinator should include jobs in distribution for the total school placement program received the most support. However, in 1971, the leaders gave most support to the statement that placement activities of the distributive education teacher-coordinator should include jobs in distribution for only those students enrolled in the distributive education cooperative program.

TABLE 5

CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT—COORDINATION IN SCHOOL SYSTEMS WITH MORE THAN ONE COOPERATIVE DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM SHOULD:

Alternatives	1960		1971	
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
a. be done by a person (or staff of coordinators) from a central office	4	8	1	3
b. be done by the person who teaches the student	41	80	28	94
c. other	6	12	0	0
No response	0	0	1	3

There is seemingly no change in the trend of thought among the leaders identified in 1960 and 1971 regarding coordination activities. Both groups contend that coordination in school systems with more than one cooperative distributive education program should be done by the person who teaches the student.

TABLE 6

CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT—IN AN IDEAL SITUATION THE TEACHER-COORDINATOR SHOULD VISIT THE STUDENT-TRAINEE ON THE JOB (OR HIS TRAINING SPONSOR) AT LEAST:

Alternatives	1960		1971	
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
a. twice a week	1	2	0	0
b. once a week	12	24	2	7
c. once every two weeks	23	45	18	60
d. once a month	6	12	8	26
e. other	9	18	0	0
No response	0	0	2	7

Concerning this issue, the leaders' trend of thought indicates a change in thinking regarding the frequency of visitations to the training station. Both groups, however, give most support to the opinion that the teacher-coordinator should visit the student-trainee on the job at least once every two weeks. There is lack of agreement on the secondary opinion: the leaders in 1960 support a once-a-week visitation schedule while the 1971 leaders support a once-a-month visitation schedule.

TABLE 7

CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT—ASSUMING THAT ON-THE-JOB EXPERIENCE IS REQUIRED, THE EXPERIENCE:

Alternatives	1960		1971	
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
a. need not be coordinated by a teacher-coordinator or coordinator	1	2	0	0
b. must be coordinated by a teacher-coordinator or coordinator	47	92	29	97
c. other	2	4	0	0
No opinion	0	0	1	3

There is no apparent change since 1960 in the trend of thought concerning this issue. The leaders identified in 1960 and 1971 agree that the on-the-job experience must be coordinated by a teacher-coordinator or coordinator.

TABLE 8

CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT—THE APPROXIMATE PERCENTAGE OF THE DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION CLASSROOM INSTRUCTIONAL TIME IN THE COOPERATIVE PROGRAM THAT SHOULD BE DEVOTED BY THE STUDENT TRAINEE TO THE STUDY OF HIS SPECIFIC JOB IS:

Alternatives		1960		1971	
		No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
a.	None	0	0	0	0
b.	less than one-fifth	3	6	2	7
c.	one-fifth to one-fourth	10	20	7	23
d.	one-fourth to one-third	11	22	8	27
e.	one-third to one-half	12	24	9	30
f.	one-half to three-fourths	8	16	2	7
g.	other	6	12	1	3
	No response	1	2	1	3

Seventy-two percent of the 1960 leaders and 87 percent of the 1971 leaders felt that one-third to one-half or less of the classroom instructional time should be devoted to the study of the student's specific job. Both groups agree on the top three chosen alternatives. They are: (1) one-third to one-half, (2) one-fourth to one-third, and (3) one-fifth to one-fourth. The fourth choice of the two groups differs. Sixteen percent of the leaders in 1960 choose alternative "f" (one-half to three-fourths) as their fourth choice, while only 7 percent of the leaders in 1971 select this alternative.

TABLE 9

CHECK-SHEET STATEMENT—DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION STUDENTS IN THE COOPERATIVE PROGRAM:

Alternatives		1960		1971	
		No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
a.	have little need for textbooks and reference materials	0	0	0	0
b.	should use one basic textbook with little or no reference to supplemental books and materials	2	4	0	0
c.	should use one basic textbook, but should refer				

TABLE 9 – Continued

Alternatives	1960		1971	
	No.	Percentage	No.	Percentage
frequently to supplemental reference books and materials	22	43	14	47
d. should use a series of reference materials with no one source designated as the basic textbook	16	31	16	53
e. other	6	12	0	0
No opinion	5	10	0	0

The responses to this issue seem to indicate a change in the trend of thought since 1960. The leaders in 1960 gave most support to the use of one basic textbook with frequent reference to supplemental reference books and materials. Their secondary choice was for a series of reference materials with no one source designated as the basic textbook. However, the majority of the 1971 leaders support the use of a series of reference materials with no one source designated as the basic textbook. Their secondary choice is a basic textbook with frequent reference to supplemental reference books and materials.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter is divided into three sections: (1) Summary, (2) Conclusions, and (3) Recommendations for Further Research.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to analyze the opinions of distributive education leaders about issues in distributive education and to ascertain their opinions on the importance of these issues in determining effective operating procedures in distributive education. To achieve the purpose of this study, it was necessary to (1) identify current distributive education issues and (2) identify distributive education leaders.

The distributive education issues used in this study were identified by (1) a literature review and (2) interviews with distributive educators.

Literature covering the period from 1936 to the present was reviewed. The most emphasis was placed on the review of the literature since 1960, because Warmke in his study of 1960 reviewed the literature up to that year. All statements suggesting or indicating conflicting points of view were recorded.

Interviews were conducted with 18 distributive educators at which time they were asked to suggest issues in distributive education.

After the issues had been identified, they were organized into a tentative check sheet.

Leadership was defined as "recognition by fellow workers," and it was in this sense that the term "leaders" was used in this study. In order to apply this test of leadership, four groups of persons were selected to nominate leaders. The four groups consisted of (1) distributive education teacher educators, (2) distributive education head state supervisors, (3) distributive education teacher-coordinators, and (4) United States Office of Education personnel.

After the leaders had been selected, a pilot study was made. The tentative check sheet of issues was evaluated by two groups of distributive education personnel. The first part was conducted with a selected group of distributive education teacher educators and state department personnel. The second part was conducted in Washington, D.C., while the writer attended a national DECA committee meeting. Fifteen persons representing all sections of the United States participated in the pilot study. The final check sheet was prepared by incorporating into the check sheet the comments of the pilot group.

The final form of the check sheet was then submitted to the total group of distributive educators identified as leaders and selected to participate in the study. Of the 30 leaders used in the study, 17 had responded within two weeks. A follow-up letter was sent to the 13 who had not responded. Nine responses were received during the next two weeks. A telephone follow-up was used on the remaining four, and all were returned.

The leaders' opinions concerning the issues and the importance of the issues were then tabulated and analyzed. The leaders were given an opportunity to make any comments about the issues and these comments were recorded.

Conclusions

On the basis of the findings, the following issue statements can be considered principles of distributive education.

(1) Distributive education should be offered at both the secondary and post-secondary levels.

(2) The post-secondary program in distributive education should primarily offer specialized programs in specific areas of marketing and distribution.

(3) The primary responsibility of distributive education at the secondary level should be to prepare most students for entry level positions in general areas as well as preparing for specialized areas when facilities are adequate.

(4) The DECA program of youth activities should be viewed as a cocurricular activity.

(5) Adult distributive education should be offered when and where needs can be identified and appropriate program developed.

(6) The state distributive education department and the local distributive education personnel should be responsible for adult distributive education.

(7) Distributive education student teachers should have student teaching experience which provides them with the opportunity to assist and observe the planning, organization, and teaching of adult courses.

(8) Teacher education should provide students majoring in distributive education with instruction in planning, organizing, and promotion of adult education.

(9) Coordination in school systems with more than one cooperative distributive education program should be done by the person who teaches the student.

(10) Assuming that on-the-job experience is required, the experience must be coordinated by a teacher-coordinator or coordinator.

(11) Students given the least priority for enrollment in distributive education should be youth whose career goals require a four-year college degree.

(12) Distributive education students should be paid for their on-the-job training on the basis of the same salary as paid to any part-time employee.

(13) A classroom with laboratory facilities such as a display unit, sales counter, cash register, etc. is for both cooperative and project method distributive education students.

(14) A written training plan is always necessary to insure optimum training.

(15) The relationship of the occupational experience for the laboratory or project teacher and the cooperative teacher should be that they both need the same occupational experience.

(16) In the preparation of distributive education teacher-coordinators, emphasis should be placed on preparing them to work with both general and specific audiences on an equal basis.

(17) The preparation of distributive education teacher-coordinators should be primarily an undergraduate program.

(18) The certification requirements for teachers in distributive education should be specific for various teachers and teacher-coordinators, post-secondary teachers, and project program teachers.

(19) For administration purposes, the Distributive Education Department should be organized as a part of the Vocational Education Department, sharing equal status with other service areas within the university.

There was lack of agreement on the following issue statements with no one alternative receiving the support of the majority; therefore, these are considered to be the major issues in distributive education.

*(1) Whether the present activities of DECA are effectively accomplishing the stated goals of the organization.

(2) How local programs of distributive education should be financed.

(3) Whether classroom instruction, with simulated in-school laboratory job experiences, is adequate preparation for a secondary school student who plans a career in a distributive occupation.

(4) Who should make the *final* selection of students for the distributive education program?

*(5) Should the distributive education classroom for the project or laboratory method program have a model store unit?

*(6) Should the distributive education classroom for the cooperative method program have a model store unit?

(7) The percentage of distributive education classroom instructional time in the cooperative program that should be devoted by the student-trainee to the study of his specific job.

(8) Who has the responsibility for establishing the distributive education teacher certification standards?

(9) Where should the distributive education teacher education program be located within the teacher training institution?

*(10) Should teacher education requirements be modified to permit non-degree teachers with substantial in-depth occupational experience to teach in the secondary schools?

(11) Should a state supported college or university be expected to provide a distributive teacher education program without additional financial support from the State Department of Education?

*(12) Should an occupational or career objective in a distributive occupation be required of all distributive education students?

(13) Should the teaching contract of the teacher-coordinator specify responsibility in the area of adult education?

*The differences in opinion on these issues exist between the alternative "strongly agree" and "agree." The majority of the respondents were in agreement; however, the dichotomy arises from the degree of agreement.

Recommendations for Further Research

(1) The present study established several principles in distributive education. A study should be conducted to determine the extent to which practices recommended by leaders in this study have been adopted at the local or state levels. If practice differs from expert opinion, the reasons for the conflict should be determined.

(2) There was lack of agreement on many of the issue statements in the present study. A study should be made on each of these issues to determine the reasons for such varying opinions.

(3) Many of the issue statements analyzed in the present study provide hypotheses for other studies. For example, the respondents believe that the occupational experience should be the same for both the project and the cooperative method distributive education teachers. Whether this opinion is tenable or not could be studied.

(4) The present study studied only the opinons of distributive educators; however, the operation of a distributive education program is often affected by others.

A study similar to the present one should be conducted to obtain opinions about issues from school administrators, guidance personnel, and businessmen. The findings of such a study should be compared to the findings of the present study to show the degree of agreement about issues of persons directly involved in distributive education with those indirectly involved.

If the different groups were divided in opinion about certain issues, the practices suggested by conflicting opinions should be tested experimentally to determine the best practice.

(5) A follow-up of the present study should be made in approximately ten years to determine (a) the changes in issues and (b) the trend of thought of leaders in distributive education about major issues.

Introduce Them To The Fine Art

. . .with marketing and distributive education materials from South-Western. Since selling can be an art in itself, students who desire to take on marketing positions in the future need the best preparation they can get. Marketing and distributive education materials from South-Western can give your students the kinds of experiences that will prepare them for lucrative careers in marketing and distribution.

FUNDAMENTALS OF SELLING
—Wingate and Nolan
RETAIL MERCHANDISING
—Wingate and Samson
MARKETING, SALES PROMOTION, AND ADVERTISING
—Nolan and Warmke
ADVERTISING AND DISPLAYING MERCHANDISE
—Samson
CREDIT AND COLLECTIONS
—Kohns
SELLING FASHION APPAREL
—Mullikin
CHECKER-CASHIER
—Edison and Mills
MERCHANDISING MATHEMATICS
—Piper
SELECTING AND BUYING MERCHANDISE
—Samson and Palmer

SOUTH-WESTERN PUBLISHING CO.

Cincinnati, OH 45227 • Dallas, TX 75229 • Palo Alto, CA 94304 • West Chicago, IL 60185
Pelham Manor, NY 10803 • Brighton, England